

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6170. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6171. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1936, to provide increased retirement benefits for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 6172. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. sec. 191), as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6173. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6174. A bill to provide assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6175. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian employee status; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 6176. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6177. A bill granting to the Imperial Irrigation District certain lands of the United States in the counties of Imperial, Riverside, and San Diego, in the State of California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mrs. ROGERS:

H. R. 6178. A bill to provide for the coverage of barbiturates under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6179. A bill to provide for terminal leave pay for enlisted service in the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6193. A bill to provide for terminal leave pay for enlisted service in the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 342. House joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 to pay increased compensation authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution on restatement of civilian and military authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6180. A bill for the relief of the Sun Laundry Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6181. A bill for the relief of Lillian Jamgochian and John Jamgochian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 6182. A bill for the relief of J. W. Cox, M. D.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6183. A bill for the relief of W. W. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

XCII—249

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of G. W. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6185. A bill for the relief of F. T. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6186. A bill for the relief of J. M. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6189. A bill for the relief of Rose Greenblatt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6190. A bill for the relief of George Stocks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6191. A bill for the relief of Virgil Dahl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 6192. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Adele Stolinsky; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1811. By Mr. CLASON: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the President of the United States to take immediate action within his authority or, if necessary, recommend to the Congress legislation to limit the importation of Swiss watches into the United States to prewar levels, thus enabling the American jeweled-watch industry to participate in the postwar market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1812. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of Mrs. Ada B. Kirkwood of Knox, Pa., and other residents of Clarion County, opposing enactment of House bill 4730, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1813. Also, petition of W. L. Kooman and other residents of Knox, Pa., opposing passage of House bill 4730 and Senate bill 1606; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1814. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Weible, and other residents of Knox, Pa., opposing passage of House bill 4730 and Senate bill 1606; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1815. Also, petition of Ralph E. McIlhattan, Knox, Pa., and other residents of Clarion County, Pa., opposing enactment of House bill 4730, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1816. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the committee on international trade of the Advertising Club of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the British loan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1817. Also, petition of the Barbers and Beauty Culturists Union of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the attack by the Wood-Rankin committee against the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

1818. By Mr. LANE: Petition received from the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Secretary of War to retain Camp Edwards for the treatment and hospitalization of veterans, and, in the event that such retention is not feasible or possible, that the Secretary of War recommend to the Congress that Camp Edwards with all facilities, furnishings, and equipment therein be

turned over to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in order that the Commonwealth may continue said camp for the treatment of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1819. Also, petition received from the General Court of Massachusetts, requesting that action be taken relative to limiting the importation of Swiss watches into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to turn to Thee is rest, to know Thee is eternal life; to serve Thee is perfect freedom. Thy mercies are new every morning and at nightfall Thy presence illumines every shadow.

In the mirror of prayer we see our boasted righteousness but as dust and ashes, and our vaunted strength as but a broken reed. Save us from error, pride, or prejudice as issues of great moment for the whole world claim the calm judgment of these decisive days. Of Thy mercy vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, so to direct, sanctify, and govern all that we do and say, and all the decisions that emerge from the deliberations of this body, that there may be in our day's work nothing of which when the evening come we shall have cause to be ashamed; at the last, make us more than conquerors as even a dark and hostile cross proves but a key to unlock the portals of life everlasting. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 17, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on business for the next 3 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from South Dakota is granted.

Mr. STANFILL. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent during 3 or 4 days of next week to fill some engagements I have made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted to the Senator from Kentucky.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1610) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5856) to provide for trade relations between the United States and the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5504) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. HOBBS, and Mr. MICHENER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 to pay increased compensation authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 75. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Locke;

S. 486. An act for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Montana;

S. 718. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

S. 1190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Henry H. Hay;

S. 1310. An act for the relief of Saunders Wholesale, Inc.;

S. 1363. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1492. An act to reimburse Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945;

S. 1601. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Valley and McCon, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Frazer, Mont.," approved August 5, 1939;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Salvatore Carbone;

H. R. 1089. An act for the relief of Albert Cantalupo, Emma Cantalupo, and the legal guardian of John Cantalupo, a minor;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ollie Patton;

H. R. 2167. An act for the relief of Orvis Welch;

H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Sherry;

H. R. 2835. An act for the relief of James Lynch;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Ernest Pedro Ferreira; and

H. R. 4253. An act for the relief of the estate of Chancie Lee Brisbin, deceased.

The President pro tempore also signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2115) relating to domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 171)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to \$400,000, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment to the Budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 117 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain postal employees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

#### CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified by the United States Maritime Commission under authority of Public Law 46, for the period beginning January 1, 1946, and ended March 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Secretary of War to retain Camp Edwards for the treatment and hos-

pitalization of veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on the 18th instant, p. 3832, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to limit the importation of Swiss watches into the United States to prewar levels; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WALSH) on the 18th instant, p. 3832, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Irish-American Associates, Middlesex County, Mass., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1620) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Commodore John Barry, father of the American Navy; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give careful consideration to and to work for the passage of bill H. R. 5742, or of bill S. 1920, of similar purport, now pending, providing for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States two bills of similar import, providing for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities, namely, bill H. R. 5742, introduced by Mrs. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and bill S. 1920, introduced by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; and

"Whereas these proposed measures would appropriate each year for 4 years the sum of \$25,000 to each State for the purpose of setting up and operating a demonstration of good library service in an inadequately served area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress be, and they are hereby earnestly requested to give careful consideration to and to work for the passage of bill H. R. 5742 or of bill S. 1920, either of which measure provides for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

#### PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Allen County Republican Club, April 3, 1946, at Fort Wayne, Ind., protesting against the proposed loan to Great Britain.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is contemplating approval of a gift to the British Empire, misnamed a loan, since the British themselves say they can never repay it; and

Whereas this gift in the net sum of \$3,750,000,000, if made, will add to a heavy burden of national debt under which the American



people now struggle \* \* \* the war debt of the United States is four times as great as the combined war debt of the rest of the world; and

Whereas if such a gift is made to Britain, similar gifts must be made to many other nations, unless we are to unfairly discriminate against nations; and

Whereas Bretton Woods was created for the purpose of giving financial aid to foreign countries, and the United States was the heaviest contributor to the Bretton Woods Bank;

Whereas the making of this gift would cancel all of England's lease-lend account amounting to \$27,000,000,000 worth of goods, and her unpaid balance of her World War debt; and

Whereas this gift need not be made to obtain the advantages which the British Empire seeks since she has raw materials and possessions which we need and she is in a position to sell; and

Whereas there is a threat that unless we make the gift, Britain will institute trade boycotts against us; and

Whereas there is such a limited supply of goods in the United States at present that purchases by England, instead of being desirable would be undesirable; Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Allen County Republican Club, bespeaking what is believed to be the sentiment of rank and file Americans everywhere, urge Senators CAPEHART and WILLIS and our Congressman GEORGE GILLIE to vote against approving the proposed gift to Britain.

#### FEDERAL CONTROLS ON SLAUGHTER OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Joint OPA Advisory Cattle, Hogs, Beef, and Pork Committees of April 15, 1946.

At the invitation of the Office of Price Administration, representatives of the OPA Advisory Committee on Cattle, Hogs, Beef, and Pork, met with representatives of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture, at room 660, Chicago Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Ill., to consider a joint OPA-Department of Agriculture proposal to reestablish Federal controls on slaughter of livestock, in other words, a quota system. I received the resolution from Reese Van Vranken, member of the OPA Cattle Advisory Committees; from Michigan. I believe it to be of such importance that it should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas price control of livestock and meat has completely broken down and black-market operators have moved in and taken control of a large percentage of the production and distribution of meat; and

Whereas the commercial meat establishments which conducted the meat business prior to OPA have had their business largely taken away by more than 26,000 new slaughterers, many who are black market; and

Whereas the potential supply of meat in the form of livestock on ranches and farms is such that a portion thereof should be liquidated now when consumers are ready, able and willing to buy meat and meat products at a price equaling the producers' cost of production; and

Whereas the black market is endangering public health, in that a large percentage of the black-market meat is being produced in plants without adequate, if any, refrigeration or other sanitary requirements; and

Whereas the black market is fixing the price that the consumer pays for meat, and OPA's "hold the line" price is pure fiction, and the cost of price control on meat now exceeds more than \$2,000,000,000 annually in excess of OPA retail ceiling prices; and

Whereas the widespread black market is causing universal disrespect for all law and is undermining the morals of the public; and

Whereas full legitimate production is the only answer to both inflation and the black-market problems. At this late date, an increase in livestock and meat ceilings will not get full legitimate production or eradicate the black market. Also, at this late date, improvised regulations, such as proposed today to the advisory committees, are not a remedy nor can additional investigators or more vigorous enforcement bring about compliance with OPA regulations. The black market can only be driven out of business if the legitimate meat packer is permitted to compete with them on even terms; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the OPA industry Cattle Hog Beef and Pork Advisory Committees are unanimously opposed to the proposal that has been submitted to the Advisory Committees and unanimously recommends that subsidies and price controls be immediately removed from the livestock and meat industry.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. 1161. A bill authorizing the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain space in the Jackson (Miss.) City Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1208); and

H. R. 2677. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209).

#### SAFE AND PROPER WORKING CONDITIONS IN INDUSTRY—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 1271) to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulation to control industrial health hazards, and I submit a report (No. 1210) thereon.

The bill was referred to a subcommittee, then the subcommittee reported it to the full committee, and the full committee now reports to the Senate, presenting a favorable report.

Mr. President, the prevention of industrial hazards is a matter of the greatest national importance from the point of view not only of the general welfare of the working population but also of the reduction of the social cost of industrial casualties. Numerous witnesses have been heard by the special subcommittee on this bill, presenting the views of Federal and State agencies concerned with matters of industrial safety, of labor or-

ganizations, and of other interested organized groups. The committee, upon thorough consideration of all the testimony presented in the hearings, believes that the bill recommended represents the most efficient and feasible plan for Federal assistance to the States in meeting the serious problems of maintaining safe and proper working conditions and reducing the social and economic waste which results from the continuation of industrial hazards.

These industrial hazards are of two kinds. First, there are those which result from accidents, then there are those which are the result of unhealthful conditions. Those two are both known as industrial hazards.

The basic provision of S. 1271 is a proposal of a program of Federal grants-in-aid for the purpose of assisting the several States in establishing and maintaining safe working conditions in industry and in promoting the observance of safety precautions and rules by employers and employees in industry.

An appropriation of \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year is authorized for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Labor, State plans for carrying out the purposes of the bill. An annual appropriation of \$200,000 is also authorized to enable the Secretary of Labor to administer the act.

The Federal administration of this program would be entrusted to the Secretary of Labor, who would have the assistance of an Industrial Safety Advisory Committee. This Committee, consisting of such numbers of public, employer, and employee representatives as the Secretary may appoint, would, in cooperation with the Secretary and State agencies administering State industrial safety laws, study existing industrial safety laws, regulations, and practices and make recommendations to the Secretary of Labor and the several States encouraging more effective control of hazardous conditions and lowering the industrial accident rate.

The bill requires each State plan to designate as the single State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the plan, that agency which administers State industrial safety laws; to provide methods of administration which will assure efficient operation and reasonable allocations of funds to enforcement and promotional functions, such methods to include the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary of Labor shall exercise no authority over the selection, tenure, or compensation of any individual employed by the States to carry out such methods; to include a program for the promotion of observance of safety precautions by employers and employees in industry, which program may include cooperation with nongovernmental safety organizations; to set forth the amounts of State funds to be expended for the purposes of this bill, and to provide for reports to the Secretary of Labor and his access to records on which such reports are based.

After approval of any State plan complying with these provisions, the Secretary of Labor shall allot 95 percent of

the appropriated funds on the basis of a formula set forth in the bill:

The amount allotted to each State shall bear the same ratio to the total appropriation as the number of nonagricultural employees in such State multiplied by the average per capita income in the United States bears to the product of the number of nonagricultural employees in the United States multiplied by the average per capita income in such State, provided that the annual allotment for each State shall be not less than \$15,000. To the extent that the total amount made available under the formula is reduced for the purpose of providing a minimum amount to each State, there shall be a proportionate reduction in the allotments to States receiving in excess of \$15,000.

Five percent of the appropriated funds shall be allotted by the Secretary for meeting special needs, which are not adequately met by the allotments under the formula. The annual allotment for any State, however, shall not exceed three times the amount of State funds to be expended for the same purposes as set forth in the act.

Mr. President, the bill has been considerably changed, principally as a result of suggestions by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and myself. I think it is very satisfactory, and that it will meet most of the objections which have been advanced against the original bill.

The only question I know of is as to the word "diseases," as it appears in one or two places. The Senator from Minnesota prefers that that word be left out. However, that is a matter for the Senate, as I see it.

Mr. President, there is this peculiar provision in the bill. It provides that State agencies administering laws relating to safe working conditions may include in their programs not only enforcement but also safety, educational, and promotional activities. The latter activities are recognized everywhere as an essential factor in controlling work injuries. Owing to inadequate facilities, however, practically nothing in this vital field is presently done by State labor departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Delaware will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) introduced Senate bill (S. 2078) to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care,

which was referred to the Committee on Finance and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CARVILLE, Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2079. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1944, relating to contract settlement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2080. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, the creation of a reserve fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2081. A bill to authorize the War Department to settle and adjust claims for war damages in foreign countries by transferring surplus property equal to the amount of such settlements; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace, at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

#### VETERAN'S PENSIONS, COMPENSATION, AND RETIREMENT PAY DURING HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself a companion bill to H. R. 4464 by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS which reads as follows:

A bill to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any provision of law or veterans' regulation, no reduction of the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay of any veteran shall be made during his hospital treatment or institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

Although Representative ROGERS introduced her bill on October 22, 1945, it is unfortunate that no action has been taken on it in the House World War Veterans' Committee nor is any action scheduled, so far as I can ascertain. I hope that our introduction of the bill in the Senate may serve to speed up action.

This bill, I believe, is an act of elementary justice for the tens of thousands of disabled ex-servicemen without dependents who are hospitalized in Veterans' Administration facilities and who are receiving a mere pittance of \$20 a month—66 cents a day—in the case of service-connected disabilities and \$8 per month—26 cents a day—in the case of non-service-connected disabilities. We might incidentally note that prisoners of war in America get 80 cents a day.

Under our bill our disabled boys' pensions would be maintained at full rates while they are hospitalized.

The reasons for our bill are obvious.

First. To deprive these veterans of their full rates of pension is in effect to make them pay for their Government hospitalization although such hospitali-

zation is supposed to be free, a part of the nonpayable debt of our Nation to our wounded men.

Thus a boy with service-connected tuberculosis, who would ordinarily get \$115 per month pension, would, if he were hospitalized and had no dependents in "permitted classes," receive only \$20 per month. This means that he would be paying the Government \$95 a month for his hospitalization.

To take another instance, there are 2,000 cases of service-connected spinal-cord-disabled boys. Many of them will be bedridden for the rest of their lives and yet those without dependents will receive only \$20 per month.

Second. Passage of this bill would be a health measure.

Thus in the instance of the tubercular boy cited above, the boy would tend to want to leave the hospital in view of the mere pittance he received while in the institution. He might disregard the fact that he is not cured of his tuberculosis, and that the TB might still be in an active stage. He probably could not be forced to remain in the institution, because our 48 State laws vary so much on this subject and are very lax in many cases. Thus this tuberculosis patient might not only become a menace to his own health on the outside but would be unfortunately, a menace to the health of the rest of the community.

Third. Just because a boy does not have dependents within "permitted classes" does not mean that he has no financial obligations.

He may have brothers and sisters who depend upon him but they are not "permitted dependents." He may have a mortgage on his farm or home.

Fourth. Passage of this bill would serve to help wipe away the infamous stain of the so-called economy drive of 1933 which slashed veterans' pensions and benefits to the bone.

That slash stabbed those who could least afford reductions in benefits, those who could not fight back, those who most deserved of their Nation. Let us undo this shameful violation of faith with America's wounded heroes.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce this bill for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2078) to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year



1946 to pay increased compensation authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

**PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. CARVILLE and Mr. MCFARLAND each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—AMENDMENT**

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes. I request that the amendment be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) Hereafter, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the act of May 31, 1941, and by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall not apply with respect to any agricultural commodity, except to the extent that such act of June 28, 1940, as amended, is applicable with respect to allocations of grain for the production of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person holding any office or position under the authority of the United States to issue or enforce any regulation, order, price schedule, or other requirement establishing any maximum price for any agricultural commodity, or relating to the rationing or allocation of or priorities for any agricultural commodity, except allocations of grain for the production of alcoholic or alcoholic beverages; and allocations of grain for such purposes shall be made only with the written approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Any person who issues any regulation, order, price schedule, or other requirement in violation of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$2,000 and shall be removed from the position or office held by him.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'agricultural commodity' includes—

"(1) Cotton and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(2) Milk and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(3) Livestock (including cattle, hogs, and sheep) and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(5) Fish and shellfish and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(6) All other agricultural products (including the basic agricultural commodities) and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(7) Petroleum and products manufactured or processed therefrom;

"(8) Timber and products manufactured or processed therefrom: *Provided*, That for the construction of houses for veterans, lumber and building materials shall be allocated by an agency to be designated by the President; and

"(9) Minerals and metals and their products manufactured or processed therefrom."

**TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT**

Mr. MCCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 25, strike out lines 7 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That subsection (b) of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised,' approved July 6, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) For a period of 1 year after the date of approval of this amendment, the Director of such mint with the consent of the owner shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 20 percent as seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received; that is, 80 percent, shall be immediately coined into standard silver dollars and the same or any equal number of other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver. The 20 percent of such silver so deducted shall be retained as bullion by the Treasury or coined into standard silver dollars and held or disposed of in the same manner as other bullion or silver dollars held in or belonging to the Treasury.

"(2) After the expiration of 1 year after the date of approval of this act there shall be delivered therefor in standard silver dollars or any other coin or coinage of the United States, the full monetary value of the silver so delivered, less such deductions for brassage, coinage, and other mint charges as the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President shall have determined, not to exceed the actual cost thereof."

"SEC. 2. The following statutes and portions of statutes are hereby repealed:

"(a) Section 1805 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended;

"(b) Sections 6, 7, and 8, and the second proviso in section 3, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 316a, 316b, and 734a).

"SEC. 3. Until June 30, 1947, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell for manufacturing uses, including manufacturing uses incident to reconversion and the building up of employment in industry, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, any nonmonetized silver held or owned by the United States, at a price of not less than \$1.03432 per fine troy ounce for a period of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and thereafter at a price of not less than the legal monetary value (of silver) per fine troy ounce: *Provided*, That no such sale shall be made unless the purchaser has certified in writing, and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied, that such purchaser has made all reasonable efforts to purchase in the open market, and notwithstanding such ef-

forts has been unable so to purchase, sufficient silver to meet his reasonable immediate requirements; and no such sale shall be made in an amount greater than the amount of silver necessary to enable such purchaser to meet his reasonable immediate requirements: *Provided further*, That on the consummation of such sale of silver by the Treasury to any purchaser, the purchaser shall immediately take possession of the silver so sold and by him purchased and remove the same from the Treasury, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *And provided further*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States Treasury of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

"Sec. 4. That hereafter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, maximum prices shall not be imposed upon foreign or domestic silver or upon silverware or jewelry."

**EFFECT OF OPA PRICE CEILINGS AND RESTRICTIONS ON BUSINESS**

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Morton Aircraft Corp., of Omaha, Nebr., which is typical of other letters I have received. The business of this corporation cannot operate because of the price ceilings and restrictions imposed by the Office of Price Administration. I think this letter typifies many letters I have received, and I should like to read it to the Members of the Senate for their information, especially since we are about to consider the extension of OPA within the next few days before the Banking and Currency Committee and later on the floor of the Senate.

The letter is as follows:

MORTON AIRCRAFT CORP.,  
Omaha 2, Nebr., April 9, 1946.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senator of Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: Due to the severe Government restrictions and seemingly unreasonable expenditures, we have been forced to liquidate the Morton Aircraft Corp. We feel and find it impossible for business to carry on and finance such ridiculous Government expenditures.

We are therefore enclosing a copy of our stockholder meetings' minutes with the hope that it will be beneficial to your carrying on and winning the battle which you are fighting.

You may use any or all parts of our letter and minutes in whatever way you wish if you feel that it will help you in your battle.

Thanking you, we remain,

Very truly yours,

MORTON AIRCRAFT CORP.,  
G. R. MORTON,  
President.

So, Mr. President, another business has been liquidated because it cannot operate under what I call the rigid pricing program that has been established by Chester Bowles.

I should like also at this point in my remarks to have printed—and I ask unanimous consent that it may be done—the minutes of the last stockholders' meeting of this outstanding aircraft production corporation that did such a great work during the war. The minutes themselves will explain why the corporation had to go out of business. I may say

that what has happened in this instance is happening to a lot of other businesses in this country.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTON AIRCRAFT CORP.,  
Omaha, Nebr., April 8, 1946.

#### STOCKHOLDERS' MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Morton, and he suggested that we have an auction sale of everything that we have here at the Morton Aircraft Corp. Due to the fact that the OPA has so many present-day restrictions, the chaotic period in which we are living, the continual uncertainty, and a few other reasons prompted Mr. Morton to make the above suggestion. Mr. Morton, as well as some of the rest of us have reached a mental point whereas a period of fishing would be very beneficial.

The following plan was discussed and we are going to complete what engines we are now working on, and we are going to complete them as efficiently as we know how. We would like to have 500 completed units. We are going to complete 2,000 props, 1,000 Beech kits, and 2,000 mounts, 1,000 to be used in the kits and 1,000 to be sold otherwise.

Regarding the Marvel vegetable cutter, we can't possibly make money on the present set-up due to the fact that each operation necessitates too much time.

It is estimated that it would take about 6 months to liquidate. It is believed that our shares will be above book value.

The Government is holding everything up so that the individual or small companies do not know whether or not they will be able to make it.

At this point of the meeting, each one was asked to give their opinion regarding the auction. All were in favor with the exception of Mike Grudenich and James Roger Beddow.

We are going to continue all work on McGrath's products, as well as the iron for the M. E. Hunter Co. and expect to have them completed by the time we liquidate.

Therefore, as a result of the auction sale, we will pay off all of our indebtedness and we will distribute the balance to the stockholders in proportion to their shares owned. The final distribution may take as long as 2 years, but a distribution will be made on all funds received.

The Ford Manufacturing Co. are willing to rent the entire upstairs for a period of 1 year for \$300 a month, this in itself would be some income while we were out fishing or resting whatever the case may be.

When we decide upon some new business to get into whether it be 3 months, 6 months, or a year, we will all be called upon. At this time we will decide whether we wish to get together again or whether we wish to continue at your present pace. Just because of our separation at this time of liquidation, it does not mean that we will not get into business together again, nor does it in any way bind us to rejoin the company again, we are on our own. The agreement is not binding in any respect.

Since there was not any further business to transact the meeting was adjourned.

Carefully submitted

MARY TURINETTI,  
Secretary.

P.S.—At this meeting several stated that they would commence looking for another job and that if and when we started up again they might not rejoin us. This was understood by all, and they were assured that this was all right.

#### OPA INCREASE IN PRICES OF WORK CLOTHES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to an article ap-

pearing in today's New York Times. The title is: "OPA Raises Prices of Work Clothes—Average of 12 to 15 Percent Advance Set So Producers Can Pay for Higher Cotton Textiles—Act To Aid Army Buying—Lists Controls Once Again on 36 Fabrics, Effective Today—Other Agency Action."

In the body of the article following that headline it is stated that the price of shirts has been raised from \$1.40 to \$1.70 so that the advance in the price of cotton can be cared for.

Mr. President, I wish to say there is not one pound of cotton in a shirt. The price of cotton is less than 30 cents. It is these continually misleading statements issued by the OPA which have brought the OPA to where it is today.

In one of the afternoon newspapers I find an article with the heading, "Bowles' and Porter's resignations predicted if House version of OPA bill is enacted by the Senate."

Mr. President, speaking as one individual, I wish to say that I hope this body will not only sustain the House in the action it has taken, but will go even further. In that way we can save Mr. Bowles the trouble of waiting to resign. As a matter of fact, if he had resigned a month ago, when I suggested that he do so, this country would be far better off today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPA RAISES PRICES OF WORK CLOTHES—AVERAGE OF 12- TO 15-PERCENT ADVANCE SET SO PRODUCERS CAN PAY FOR HIGHER COTTON, TEXTILES—ACTS TO AID ARMY BUYING—LISTS CONTROLS ONCE AGAIN ON 36 FABRICS, EFFECTIVE TODAY—OTHER AGENCY ACTION

WASHINGTON, April 17.—The Office of Price Administration increased retail prices of staple work clothing by an average of 12 to 15 percent today to enable manufacturers to pay higher prices for raw cotton and textiles.

The higher price is required by terms of the Price Control Act, OPA explained, which provide that earnings of the industry must approximate what they were in the prewar years 1936-39. Increased costs resulting from advances in the price of raw cotton and higher wage levels in textile and apparel mills necessitated the price increase to make the regulation conform to the law, it was stated.

As a result of the higher legal price, consumers will pay approximately \$1.70 for a chambray work shirt which formerly cost about \$1.40 at an independent retail store, and \$2.72 for a pair of denim bib overalls heretofore costing about \$2.44.

OPA also lifted price controls once again from the 36 cotton fabrics made for the Army after having reimposed maximum prices on January 1, 1946.

The price exemption, which becomes effective tomorrow, applies to finished goods sold under Government contract to the War Department entered into after April 18. It covers also gray goods for which contracts are signed with converters after this date, provided converters are under contract to the War Department for finished fabrics made of gray goods.

The 36 fabrics were exempted from price regulations when delivered on War Department contracts or subcontracts between April 16, 1945, and December 31, 1945.

Other announcements included:

Building materials: Adjustments of maximum prices established under area orders for building and construction materials may now be made by regional OPA administrators and district directors, the agency ruled.

Rubber footwear: Dollar-and-cent ceilings were fixed by OPA for 20 additional types of men's and women's surplus rubber footwear, with prices identical with those for similar civilian articles.

Floor coverings: Manufacturers of wool floor coverings were granted by OPA an additional 4.72 percent increase over January 1946, ceilings, bringing the total increase to 9.72 percent since the first of the year, retroactive to April 8.

Motor vehicles: Maximum prices for resale of new surplus motor vehicles and trailers were established by OPA.

Hardware: Nonferrous nails, tacks, escutcheon pins and staples covered by GMPR and certain ferrous types were suspended by OPA from price control.

Beans: Minor changes in the price regulation covering processed beans were announced by OPA, effective April 22.

Lumber: To enable mills to meet higher log and labor costs, OPA granted an average increase of \$4.50 per 1,000 board feet, or about 7½ percent, in mill ceilings of western red cedar lumber, effective April 22, with the increase to be passed on.

Lumber imports, exports: National Housing Expediter Wyatt announced that imports of construction lumber exceeded exports during January and February by almost 60,000,000 board-feet. Imports in that period exceeded 160,000,000 board-feet, of which about 104,000,000 was for building purposes. Exports amounted to 112,000,000 board-feet, of which about 45,000,000 was for building construction.

#### ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE BLACK AT ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL DINNER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an able address delivered by a former Member of this body, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Hugo L. Black, at the National Citizens Political Action Committee Roosevelt memorial dinner, the Hotel Commodore, New York, on Friday, April 2.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We who are gathered here tonight come from many different places and environments. We are of diverse faiths, beliefs, occupations, and races. But we are together because we are united by a common bond. That bond is the love all of us have felt for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and our common devotion to the principles of genuine democracy to which he gave his service and his life.

It is a cherished honor, Mr. Chairman, to have been selected as one of those privileged to speak his sentiments to such a gathering upon such an occasion as this. For this reason I accepted your gracious invitation.

A year ago today Franklin Delano Roosevelt left us. When that news flashed around the world, all of the people—those who agreed with his policies and those who violently disagreed with him—recognized that a great leader had passed away. He had passed away in the midst of terrible times, when great leaders were rare and very much needed. This Nation was engaged in a bitter life-and-death struggle. The failure of economic systems and the consequent disintegration of moral values, together with selfish ambitions, greed, intolerance, and disillusion had brought about that struggle. Only those on the side of the United Nations, only those who still clung to a faith in their ideals



of good government of decent values, could hope to restore peace and the good life to a warring world. Over two decades before we had been engaged in a similar struggle for similar purposes. The war was won, but victory did not bring tranquility to the people in this troubled world. Instead, disillusion and desperate cynicism followed. That disillusion and cynicism still embittered and blinded people when the second struggle began. The forces of disillusion capitalized on that fact. Yet Franklin Delano Roosevelt was able to provide the leadership that restored faith to the American people in the possibility of a better world to come. Our people sacrificed security. We sacrificed the comforts of immediate peace. Some gave their best, many gave their all, to win this battle that had engulfed the rest of the world. All the world recognized Franklin Delano Roosevelt as the natural leader of this new humanitarian restoration. The confidence of people in his leadership led them to regain their faith in the possibility of democracy all over the world.

We all remember how magnificently this country became transformed into an arsenal of democracy. This was not merely an arsenal of weapons and of the machinery of war. It was an arsenal of ideas and of a burning democratic faith. All this was done by people who for many years during this century had come to take democracy for granted. All this was done by a people that for many years had feared extensive participation in international affairs. No one can tell nor will anyone ever be able to tell whether events would have happened as they did had Franklin Delano Roosevelt not been the leader of his country during its most trying times. One thing is clear. Everyone, friend and enemy, recognized that he had a great deal to do with our transformation, with our awakening to new responsibilities. Roosevelt was the man of the hour. He was the kind of democratic leader a democratic people wanted and needed during trying times. His charming smile, his genuine love for the people, his ability to compromise, his ability to take a strong stand and stick by it when the times required it, and his ability to plan ahead, all meant that he personified democratic ideals.

There was no magic to his leadership. There was no sinister Machiavellian scheme to it either. Roosevelt was a successful, a loved, and a true leader, and the people followed him because they trusted him. His formula for leadership was a simple democratic one. When the times called for it, he educated the people. When the people demanded action, he acted. Above all, while cherishing sound traditions, he was not afraid of the new and unexplored. He restored power to the sinews of democracy by ruthlessly exterminating debilitating dogmas disguised as honored traditions. His career which culminated with his great commandership during the second bitter war is and will remain a model for democratic leadership.

But it is a mistake to think of Roosevelt only as a wartime commander. His great ability as a democratic leader was demonstrated during his many years as President before we were forced to go to war. As a peacetime leader he also brought renewed democratic faith to a people that had become cynical and disillusioned. It is not necessary to describe at length the economic crisis that faced this country and the world in 1932. We all remember the farmers whose lands were sold for taxes and the many idle industrial workers, desperately looking for jobs. We all remember the financial ruin, general chaos, despair, and apathy that paralyzed our economy. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt did not despair. He had faith in democracy and faith in our people and faith in our country. Even before he became President in 1932 he felt deeply the seriousness of the times and the need for calling on the

people to regain its democratic strength and to work cooperatively for a better America. He addressed the following important words to all of us: "These unhappy times call for the building of plans that rest upon the forgotten, the unorganized, but the indispensable units of economic power, for plans like these of 1917 that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten men at the bottom of the economic pyramid."

Later events proved that these words were not mere empty phrases. For when Roosevelt became President, reform followed with the speed of lightning. The natural resources of our richly endowed country which had been slowly but surely turning into a wasteland were made to serve the people. Many of the people who had been forced into idleness against their wishes, but who were capable of doing useful work, were employed at a living wage to save our forests, to improve our parks, to build roads and streets, and to make available much needed recreation centers. Great dams were built to harness the power of our streams. New industries and thousands of new homes sprang into being. Parts of our country that for a long time had known nothing but want and degradation were thus transformed into healthy and happy communities. Roosevelt's vision to build from the bottom up was becoming a reality.

His administration made the people's bank savings secure. New laws were enacted to curb business practices that had resulted in fleecing many for the advantage of a few. The distressed owners of mortgaged farms and city dwellings were given a chance to keep their homes. These things, too, are what Roosevelt meant when he had spoken about the forgotten man and about building from the bottom up.

Roosevelt and his administration worked for and made substantial progress toward social security for all the people. Not only did unemployment actually diminish, but a higher standard of living for the many was provided, and unemployment compensation and old-age pensions became a reality, not merely a bait for use by unscrupulous demagogues. Roosevelt sought to strengthen business by protecting it against speculation, monopoly, and fraud, and by increasing consumer purchasing power. He worked, campaigned, and fought so that farmers and workers in industry might get a fair share of the gains of strengthened business. That, also, is what Roosevelt meant by building from the bottom up.

Of course, a good deal of the legislation he recommended was experimentation. For while the Government had been used before to help some people it had never before been used to such an extent as an instrument of economic control for the benefit of so many people. And, of course, as with all experimentation, there were mistakes. But even the mistakes that were made taught lessons for the future and provided an intelligent and workable approach toward achievement of a better society. For the proof of this, one need only study the later Presidential campaigns and see that even those political parties that opposed Roosevelt began to accept many of the innovations that were once called radical and revolutionary. And today most of those innovations are accepted as essential parts of our governmental program.

All these changes did not come about without vigorous opposition. The opposition was composed in part of those who were seeking selfishly to maintain unfair practices under which they had greatly prospered and by those who innocently clung blindly to old ways merely because they were old. That opposition was fierce indeed. But Roosevelt was willing to face that opposition because he believed his program was right and his faith in the people

led him to believe that they too believed in building this Nation's prosperity from the bottom up. In this struggle he proved a skillful political craftsman. He has been frequently attacked for that, but those who believe in democracy must accept as a part of it, in a Nation such as ours, all the fair political activities essential to the achievement of concrete and constructive action. Roosevelt's great political craftsmanship simply meant that he used the instruments of democracy for the purposes of democracy—the good of all.

The internal and international problems of today are of a kind that can be far more serious than the difficult problems that existed in 1932. For these problems are not only world-wide in scope but there is also an air of finality about them, because of the pervading threat of the atomic bomb. Today, Roosevelt would probably have faced these problems as he did all others, with the idea and purpose of building anew in the midst of chaos, and building as always from the bottom up. But Roosevelt is no longer with us. He is no longer here to gather together all of those who are devoted to the ideal of a government that works directly for the benefit of all, rather than a government that bestows special favors on a few in the hope that the few will then divide their favors with the many. Yet you who believed, and still believe, in his philosophy are still among the living. That philosophy cannot remain a living force unless you people who believe in it fight for it. What does it mean to build anew today? Roosevelt showed that building anew means experimentation. His philosophy in this respect was one which many great men have believed in throughout the ages: The old should not be abandoned merely because it is old, but age alone should not bar the adoption of new and better methods. Roosevelt deplored the state of mind that refuses to face the possibility of new devices, of different ways of doing things, that refuses to discuss them, that refuses to think in their terms. Our people have had the great privilege of living in a democracy for over a hundred and fifty years. Democracy and government by and for the people means immediate and quick response to the people's needs, means expression and communication of new ideas and new thoughts, means experimentation in carrying out, in putting into effect, many new ideas and new thoughts. Roosevelt believed in that kind of democracy. He would believe in that kind of democracy today. He believed in the democratic method of bringing people of like minds together to accomplish common objectives. You who are heirs of Roosevelt's philosophy, and on whose shoulders it has fallen to face the serious times ahead without his leadership in person, can follow his spirit.

To bring about peace and cooperation among the nations Roosevelt proposed that we abandon our old policy of isolation and adopt the United Nations Organization. Today there are already many who say that we should not advance one step beyond the United Nations Organization as it now stands. Even if that were true, I am sure Roosevelt did not think of it as being the last possible word. He proposed the United Nations Organization as something we must try to make work. If it should not work, or if there is a sign that it might not work, we must help to change it or change the organization of nations. In other words, when we face the task of building anew, we must not fear the possibility of making the United Nations Organization strong enough to preserve the peace of the world.

Too many of us who comment today on world affairs are tempted to comment on them in terms of the old traditional logic of international relations. This leads to analyzing everything in terms of power politics.

All problems are thus seen in terms of problems of the interest of Russia, as against the interests of Great Britain and the United States; the interests of the United States as against those of Russia and Britain; or the interests of Britain against those of the United States and Russia. World peace is envisioned as wholly dependent on some compromise of these various power interests. That may be the road toward world peace, but it has not led there in the past. You who want to follow Roosevelt's aims must consider possible alternatives. You must consider the possibility of building economies for the benefit of the starving people of the world. It becomes important for you to ask yourselves the question whether building anew from the bottom up means building the economy of India for the Indian people, the economy of China for the Chinese, the economy of Iran for the Iranians, of Poland for the Poles, and integrating the economies of all countries for the good of all the people of all the countries of the world. Perhaps we should discuss as a real possibility the giving up of power politics on the part of all nations.

Those who follow Roosevelt's policies must remember that with reference to international affairs his underlying philosophy was hatred of war and love of peace. In domestic affairs Roosevelt carried out his belief in the fullest governmental protection of the weak from exploitation by the strong and powerful. As he put it: "America calls for government with a soul." Roosevelt became a war leader, not because he liked it, but because it was the only chance, indeed it was the last possible chance, of saving our democratic way of life. His own words were: "The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers; we are builders \* \* \*." This was his good neighbor policy which he hoped would replace the old power-politics big-bully policy. This policy means extension of a friendly hand to all people and all nations that love and want peace. And real friendship means that we can live together and face common problems together with those whose economic systems differ from ours. Roosevelt discarded and disavowed the dangerous belief that all nations that produce and distribute goods in ways different from ours are our natural enemies. To promote peace, he recognized Russia despite the outraged clamor of a vociferous minority. The friendship that thus began proved to be the key to our victory over Nazi greed and cruelty which threatened the peace of mankind. Continuation of this policy of friendship for Russia and all other peace-loving nations, should, and I am sure will, turn out to be the key to lasting peace. Again a vociferous minority is opposed. We must not let it succeed.

All of those, however, who believe that Roosevelt's humanitarian philosophy would make the United States a better Nation, and the world a better world, the small group gathered here and all forward-thinking people everywhere, would do well to reflect very often on what Roosevelt himself once said: "For all these things we have just begun to fight."

#### BLACK-OUT OF NEWS IN EASTERN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY MARK ETHRIDGE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Black-out of News in Eastern Europe," written by Mark Ethridge, and published in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, April 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE BRITISH LOAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British Loan," published in the New York Times of April 18, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE BRITISH LOAN—ARTICLE FROM THE NORTH PLATTE (NEBR.) TELEGRAPH

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the proposed British loan, published in the North Platte (Nebr.) Telegraph on February 28, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POLAND, THE VICTIM OF APPEASEMENT—ADDRESS BY CHARLES ROZMAREK

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Poland, the Victim of Appeasement," delivered on March 24, 1946, by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress and president of the Polish National Alliance, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY OSCAR R. EWING

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day address delivered by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., March 23, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### "VENGEANCE IS MINE, SAITH THE LORD"—ADDRESS BY GEORGE B. WOOD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Vengeance Is Mine, Saith the Lord," delivered on April 4, 1946, by the Reverend George B. Wood, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, in Austin, Minn., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### STATUS OF THE SHIPPERS' CONFERENCE OF GREATER NEW YORK—LETTER FROM G. E. MACE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 15, 1946, addressed to him by G. E. Mace, first vice chairman of the Shipper's Conference of Greater New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### STATUS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK—LETTER FROM THOMAS J. MILEY

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter under date of April 10, 1946, addressed to him by Thomas J. Miley, secretary of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POTASH AND OTHER FERTILIZERS IN FOOD PRODUCTION IN WISCONSIN—STATEMENT OF EMIL TRUOG

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Emil Truog, chairman of the department of soils, University of Wisconsin, and a statement by Mr. Truog entitled "Fertilizers, Particularly Potash, in Relation to Food Production in Wisconsin," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DRAFTING OF COLLEGE STUDENTS—EDITORIAL FROM CLEMSON COLLEGE TIGER

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Draft—A Crisis," published in the Tiger, student newspaper of Clemson Agricultural and Mechan-

ical College, Clemson, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM YOUNGSTOWN (OHIO) VINDICATOR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Would Help All United States," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Answer to Mr. Hood," published in the Detroit News of March 3, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hart	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brewster	Huffman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Brooks	Kilgore	Stewart
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	White
Ellender	Mitchell	Wiley
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murdoch	Young
Gerry	Murray	
Gossett	O'Daniel	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.



The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKEN-LOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, any person who opposes the British loan is characterized by the New Deal press as a hater of Great Britain; he is accused of being an Anglophobe, an old guarder, a standpatter, an America-Firster, an isolationist, a man without vision who wants to draw the curtain around America and live and act for America alone. The New Deal press, and their propagandists, including the alleged newspaper columnists, throw mud and dirt and slime at any man who has honest convictions which do not happen to coincide exactly with their viewpoints, or their line of propaganda. Then there are the commentators on the radio who vent their poisonous spleen at any legislator who makes a statement or casts a vote against the views and propaganda as expressed by them over the radio networks.

As an illustration of this, in an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, November 13, 1945, entitled "Ballyhoo for Britain," it was said:

The American public is expected to drop its opposition to the loan for Britain between now and the turn of the year. It won't happen by accident. Five top Government agencies are mobilizing their opinion-manufacturing machinery for a campaign which will start soon and which officials say will be running at full tilt by December when Members of Congress will be home listening to constituents. \* \* \* Some of it will be a bit obscure; the Government aims to help in preparation of many a magazine article, Sunday newspaper feature, and privately sponsored radio programs plugging for this loan. A great many activities will be entirely behind the scenes. Plans are afoot for off-the-record sessions in Washington and other cities from coast to coast, in which officials will indoctrinate businessmen, club women, labor, and farm leaders and representatives of literally hundreds of organizations—all carefully chosen for maximum influence on public thinking. Religious leaders, both ministers and laymen, will be among those welcomed to Washington for education, officials say, much as during the campaign to sell the Bretton Woods monetary plan.

One of our esteemed colleagues, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in a speech delivered at the University of Chicago on February 19, and reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD on March 12, said:

The legislator is an indispensable guardian of our freedom. \* \* \* If there is one characteristic of Members of Congress it is sincerity. With few exceptions they are deeply concerned over reaching the correct conclusions on every controversial issue. They go through agonies of mental torture in their effort to reconcile the interests of their constituents with the demands of their fellow Members and their conception of the national welfare. The average citizen sees the issue from the standpoint of his own business, his own community and his own private prejudices. He has not heard the other side. \* \* \* He cannot understand why his representative hesitates and compromises with his colleagues.

But it seems to me that the people at home are much more generous, after all,

in their thinking than are the wolves of the propaganda machines. To them there is always only one side.

I have, I confess, had more trouble, have suffered more mental torture, and have changed my thinking on the issue of the British loan more than on any other issue which has confronted me in the whole of my life.

Many things have worried me about this proposed loan, only a few of which I shall enumerate. The question is asked: If I were the lender, would I agree personally to make this loan in view of the record? Probably no banker would make it. Let us see what the record shows. Who is already England's largest creditor? Of course it is the United States. How does our ledger stand and what does it show? It has been shown over and over again that as a result of World War I we extended to England a credit of \$6,000,000,000. She has not paid it back; in fact, she has paid only about 6 cents on the dollar and repudiated the remainder, and we have not been able to collect 1 cent of that money since that time.

In the progress of World War II, and even before we became involved in that holocaust, we began advancing more credit to England. Was it a loan? It was not called that, but we considered it a loan. Mr. Roosevelt coined one of his ingenious phrases and instead of calling it a loan or a credit to England he said it was "lend-lease." What did we understand by the term "lend-lease"? The American people undoubtedly took the President at his word in his own definition or explanation of this catchy phrase. In a message to Congress relating to lend-lease he said, "For what we send abroad we shall be repaid within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities in similar materials or at our option in other goods of many kinds, which they can produce and which we need."

"The close of hostilities" about which he spoke has come about. Is there any thought that any of this "lend-lease" which was to be repaid "within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities" will ever be repaid. Every school child in America knows the answer to that question.

We are told that we have furnished to Great Britain \$25,000,000,000 or more by way of lend-lease, for which we are again now told we will collect about 3 cents on the dollar, to be paid, however, over a number of years running into 2000 A. D. This is not being repaid within a reasonable time or "in similar materials or at our option in other goods of many kinds which they can produce and which we need," to use the words of President Roosevelt. In addition to all this, we have carried the burden of the Pacific War with but very little help from England, and have thus recovered for England a vast empire which she had actually lost and which she never could have regained.

Even the British in Parliament say that they cannot repay this loan. As a Nation we are abused by the British for not making this a gift outright instead of calling it a loan. No mention is made by them of the fact that we have for-

gotten and written off the loan of the First World War, and have forgiven the \$25,000,000,000 of lend-lease which we were so glibly promised would be repaid to us. In both cases we furnished them what was infinitely more important than money. We furnished as a part of lend-lease, at least, iron, oil, food, timber, clothing, copper, nickel—indeed, all the precious commodities which are the true foundation of our national wealth and well-being and prosperity. Most of these things cannot be replaced save by purchasing them from other countries, and thus our resources are gone forever.

Only last summer Sydney Campbell, financial editor of Reuters was quoted as saying:

One thing should be made clear about the present discussions in the United States about a loan of three to five billion dollars to Britain. Britain would almost certainly refuse any such loan, however big it might be or however low the interest. They are rather mystified as to why Americans trouble to discuss the matter. A grant in aid would, of course, be accepted.

Lord Keynes was quoted in the press at about the same time as saying:

No doubt an easy course would be for you to offer and for us to put our name to a substantial loan, on more or less commercial terms, without either party to the transaction troubling to pay too much attention to the likelihood of our being able to fulfill the obligations which we are undertaking.

The same Lord Keynes, in explaining to the House of Lords why this loan had to be accepted instead of an out-and-out grant or gift said:

The American Congress and the American people have never accepted any literal principle of equal sacrifice, financial or otherwise, between all of the Allied participants.

I doubt if we can convince our American boys who stormed the Normandy beachheads that we did not equally sacrifice, especially when we remember that from the very first Mr. Churchill insisted the we must participate in that invasion on the basis of 70 Americans to 30 men of the British Empire, and carried this point all the way through until we did use 70 American boys to every 30 British troops in this whole invasion. Then, too, this loan carries a rate of less than 2 percent interest, when we charge the veterans who stormed the Normandy beachheads and invaded the fortress of Europe, over the protests of Churchill and the English Government, as well as the boys who did the fighting in the foxholes in the Pacific in order to restore the vast empire to the British, an interest rate of 4 percent on their loans. If we make this loan we should reduce our veterans interest rate to the same rate we charge Great Britain.

I quote from the text of former Ambassador Kennedy's reply to the New York Times inquiry on this subject:

Of necessity, I heartily favor financial aid for the United Kingdom by the Government of the United States. The question is not whether the British have a right to demand this aid. They have not. But it is to our enlightened self-interest to grant it.

After all, Britain is our best customer in foreign trade; the British people and their way of life form the last barrier in Europe

against communism; and we must help them to hold that line.

I agree, it is true, with virtually everything said by those in both countries who oppose a British loan as formulated by the United States Government. The United Kingdom fought from 1939 to 1942 to save its own skin, and to this commendable singleness of purposes—the following public words from Mr. Churchill offer adequate testimony, if any were needed: "During those years I was working, hoping, praying night and day that the United States would enter the war."

So we owe the British nothing on that basis.

Many other arguments are made against the advisability of the loan. As heretofore stated, I have suffered much mental torture regarding this loan. Each time in summarizing in my own mind the arguments against it, only a few of which I have enumerated, my mind and conscience tell me that the only two democracies in the world had better stand together and help and support each other in the face of the chaotic conditions now existing on the earth. I do not want any military alliance with Great Britain; nor do we, in fact, need one. We both speak the same language; we are both democracies in this world which has been torn apart and almost destroyed by the devastation of the latest World War. We do, I believe, have an understanding of each others' problems; and we in America believe that England is one country that will never wage war against us, and we, likewise, know we will never wage war against England. This one outstanding virtue, common to our two countries, makes one stop and rethink, reanalyze, and reconsider the arguments for and against the proposed loan. If this world is to be saved from utter destruction it must be saved by our two nations. Thinking these things over again and again, and realizing that in this atomic age we may not have any other real friend, I find myself coming back to the question. If Great Britain really needs this loan, would it or not be the course of wisdom for us to make the loan even though we may fear it will never be repaid?

The question then arises, Why do Churchill and the opposition, and why do Lord Keynes and so many others among the English people object to the loan? Why do they take the attitude that we are trying to compel them to take the loan? Perhaps the answer may well be that England realizes that when the full terms of the agreement are met she will lose much of her world trade to us.

I have, carefully as I could, studied the arguments made for the loan. I do not mean to imply by what I have said or may say that we should buy favor from Great Britain or any other country.

Is this loan necessary to enable Great Britain to maintain economic trade relations with us or with other countries of the world? Or is it incumbent upon us to make the loan in order to participate in world trade? She has been forced to block her credits due to other countries, or to freeze them, so that they cannot be converted into dollars with which to buy American goods. It is said that there is more than \$13,000,000,000 in London banks belonging to other countries which

can be used by the other countries to buy goods only where the seller accepts sterling; and England has been forced, it is claimed, to refuse to allow it to be converted into dollars. Consequently America cannot sell its goods to those countries. For instance, Australia cannot buy American cotton, because our growers will not or cannot accept sterling, but she can buy Egyptian cotton and pay for it in sterling. Many similar instances could be cited. In practice this means that countries of the sterling area cannot use the sterling they receive for their exports to buy American goods. In short, while trade among the sterling-area countries continues unaffected by these currency restrictions, the trade of all the sterling-area countries with the United States is subject to the will of Britain. The sterling area now includes all the countries of the British Empire except Canada and a number of other countries, mainly in the Middle East. Those countries do their business with England and keep their monetary reserves in the form of sterling in London.

Before the war sterling could be used by those countries to buy goods in the United States, because sterling was freely convertible into dollars. But during the war the sterling area took on some new features. Because England did not have enough gold dollars, she could no longer permit sterling to be sold freely, and was forced by economic conditions to make sterling inconvertible. This really amounted to freezing sterling. This simply means that all the sterling area countries have to trade with England; their credits are in sterling and cannot be converted to dollars, and therefore they cannot buy our products. We must, therefore, change the system. Either we shall have prosperity-producing world trade or we shall have economic blocks, which will sow the seeds of another world war.

The countries that have close trade and currency relations with Britain are a major factor in world trade. Together they account for 55 percent of world imports and nearly 50 percent of world exports. Clearly, what such a group does with respect to currency and trade policy must be a major factor in the world economy.

Our own trade relations with this group thus far have been very close. Nearly half of our total exports and imports in the years 1936-38 went to the countries of the sterling area and to the payment agreements countries. Omitting Germany and Japan, 56 percent of our trade was with those countries.

Our whole program for maintaining high levels of production, employment, and national income would be seriously affected. In six commodity groups, constituting more than 80 percent of all United States exports in 1937, these countries were our indispensable buyers. Of our metal machinery and vehicle exports, they took 47 percent; of our leaf tobacco exports, they took 88 percent; of our meat, grain, and other food exports, they took 59 percent; of our raw cotton exports, they took 49 percent; of our pe-

troleum and related exports, they took 46 percent; and of our wood and paper exports, they took 47 percent.

In brief, here is what we gain by the financial agreement, according to our Treasury Department:

First. Exports of goods and services from the United States to England will be paid for in dollars, or if they are paid in pounds, the sterling can be converted into dollars. This is particularly important to the American companies which in the past have experienced considerable difficulty in getting their earnings out of England. They will now be able to get dollars. That means, for all practical purposes, that American businessmen can be just as sure of payment for their current claims in England as they were before the war.

Second. Within a year, unless in exceptional cases the United States agrees to a later date, England will make all sterling arising from current trade convertible. England will thus return to the free use of sterling in international trade that she permitted before the war. For example, if Mexico and Egypt export goods to England, they will be able to use the money they get to buy goods in any country. That means they could convert the sterling into dollars and buy goods in the United States.

Third. Within a year, unless in exceptional cases the United States agrees to a later date, England will dissolve the sterling area dollar pool. Each country in the sterling area will again have complete freedom to use its dollars as it wishes. For example, the money India gets for its exports to the United States and Latin America could be spent here without getting an allocation of dollars from England. That means India could use the dollars she gets to buy American machinery, instead of being forced to buy English machinery.

Fourth. The blocked sterling balances will be settled by England and the countries concerned. All payments on these balances now or later will be free for making purchases in any country, including the United States. This large debt will not be used to exclude American products from the sterling area, or to put our exporters at a disadvantage in competition with British exporters. England will not force the countries holding \$13,000,000,000 in blocked sterling to buy British instead of American goods.

Fifth. England's import controls will be administered in a manner which does not discriminate against American products. If England finds it necessary to impose a quantitative limitation on her imports, this will be applied on an equal basis toward all countries. That means England will not keep out American cotton and tobacco, grains and meats, fruits and nuts, or any of our industrial products, in order to buy similar commodities in other countries.

Sixth. Within a year, unless in exceptional cases the United States agrees to a later date, England will impose no restrictions on payments and transfers for ordinary current transactions. In effect, all of the countries that have payment agreements with England will be per-



mitted to use the proceeds of their sales to England, if they wish to buy goods in other countries. They will be allowed to use the sterling they acquire in this way to buy American products on the same basis as they are able to buy British products.

In addition, England has agreed that she will support the American proposal for an international trade organization to reduce trade barriers and eliminate trade discriminations. Thus England gives wholehearted support to our policy of expanded trade, with all countries having access to world markets on fair and equal terms. The adoption of the proposed fair trade practices will complete our program for international economic cooperation. England's support of our proposal assures the success of the United Nations trade conference to be held later this year.

It is claimed that this loan is not a precedent and we are assured no other loans will be made to other countries. We were also assured that the loans to Great Britain during and following World War I would be paid, but this assurance was not carried out. We were assured that lend-lease to Great Britain would be repaid, but this glib promise and assurance was not carried out. So it is my judgment that we cannot rely on these assurances, but we must judge each loan on its own merits.

None of the arguments advanced by the proponents of the loan, excepting the one I shall now mention, are sufficient to convince me that we should further burden our own taxpayers and bondholders with this loan. It is said that this loan is an investment in peace and prosperity. If that is sound, if it is true, I shall vote for the loan.

We have spent probably more than \$200,000,000,000 in a war we were told would save civilization; and the question now uppermost with me is whether we had better make this loan, even if it should never be repaid, and though we can ill-afford to do it and though we thereby further burden our living taxpayers and their children's children with this debt, in order to maintain the balance of world trade and world salvation, lest otherwise the British people actually be driven into the arms of communism.

There is much force to all of the arguments made against the loan. But they have to be weighed against the fact that, without this loan, the British economy will collapse, or, if it survives, it will be as a result of economic conflict destructive of our own best interests.

The loan is conditioned on the abandonment by Britain of restrictive trade practices and the adoption of policies designed to encourage a freer and wider international exchange of goods. It is obvious, of course, that even with approval of the loan, these hoped-for improvements in international economic conditions may not be realized. But the alternative is equally obvious, namely, that without the loan, there can be no hope at all of creating the conditions under which the nations of the world

can do business profitably and peacefully with one another.

Now, in its consideration of the agreement, Congress has come to the point where it must choose between these alternatives.

The loan is supported by the United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce. The membership of the United States Associates includes individual business concerns and such important national business organizations as the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Bankers Association, and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GOSSETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STANFILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator has been reading a list of names of those who are supporting the proposed loan. All that have been read so far are exporters; are they not?

Mr. STANFILL. No; I do not think so. The American Bankers Association are not exporters.

Mr. STEWART. They are about the largest exporters we have, as I understand.

Mr. STANFILL. There may be a difference in our point of view about that.

Mr. STEWART. Perhaps, the difference is in what are considered to be exports.

Does the Senator know what Mr. Jesse Jones would say about the proposed loan?

Mr. STANFILL. Yes; Mr. Jesse Jones would say, I think, that we should not make the loan.

Mr. STEWART. He was not called to testify, though; was he?

Mr. STANFILL. I do not know; I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know what Mr. Bernard Baruch would say about it?

Mr. STANFILL. All I know is that I have seen in the press statements to the effect that Mr. Bernard Baruch says he would not make the loan.

Mr. STEWART. He has not been called to testify, either; has he?

Mr. STANFILL. I do not know; I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know what Mr. Leo T. Crowley, formerly a director of the Export-Import Bank, would say about it?

Mr. STANFILL. I do not know.

Mr. STEWART. He did not testify, either; did he?

Mr. STANFILL. I do not know.

Mr. STEWART. These men are all outstanding financiers, and are so considered; are they not?

Mr. STANFILL. They are so considered, and I think they are.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know of any other man in international

finance of the standing of Mr. Jesse Jones?

Mr. STANFILL. A statement with reference to Mr. Jesse Jones might be a matter of opinion. I do not care to express myself in that regard.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator knows of someone whose opinion he values more highly than that of Mr. Jones, I should like to know about him.

Mr. STANFILL. I am not prepared to enter into such a discussion.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the fact that the various organizations to which I have referred belonged to the International Chamber of Commerce, because I wished to read a statement of the executive committee of that organization, as follows:

The extension of the line of credit on the terms and conditions proposed would be a major step in the restoration of world commerce and toward the elimination of state direction and control. The forces of private enterprise throughout the entire world would be strengthened.

Mr. President, to the timorous who fear that the loan would only be a means of financing nationalization of the British economy, the committee observed:

Foreign governments do not need dollars to nationalize their industries, British properties to be transferred from private hands to public ownership will be paid for in pounds sterling, not in foreign currencies. In fact, without the credit, further governmental control and direction of foreign trade is inevitable, and the pressures for increased government operation of key domestic industries would become more insistent. The true purpose and effect of the loan is to arrest the trend toward nationalization.

This proposed financial arrangement would be an investment in world peace and world prosperity. If the executive department is correct in its statement that the loan will be repaid, the burden will be made easier for the taxpayers who come after we are gone. None of us now in the Senate of the United States will live to see or know whether it will all be repaid according to the terms of the agreement; but I believe American business will reap rich dividends through its access to world markets on a fair and equal basis.

No one will say that we can now in this modern day go backward in our thinking. Modern science and ingenuity have truly made this one world, and that can be as truly said of our economic and business and trade relations as it is said of our social and political relations. We cannot turn back the clock; neither can we turn back our thinking. Every section of America and every sector of our economy depends in part on world trade.

It is claimed that the financial agreement upon which the proposed loan is based will open the markets of England, of all the countries of the British Empire, and of the sterling area or bloc to our people. That will mean more exports for our farmers and manufacturers, more jobs for our workers, greater profits for business, and a higher income for all our people.

We live in a world which is growing more interdependent economically as well as politically, and it is the great hope of the people of this Nation that we can build the kind of world that our hearts and minds desire.

Our divine destiny will never be fulfilled while there is war and want on this earth. We cannot survive another atomic war; neither can we survive an economic war which will plunge us into another depression. Our own well-being, in an economic sense, depends on the well-being of the other countries and the other peoples of this world. We must have faith—faith in England, faith in humanity, and, above all, faith in ourselves and in our own divine destiny bravely and boldly to set a course which will mold the destiny of the world for many generations yet to come. That is why I shall vote for this loan.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I am surprised that a Senator from an agricultural State would make a speech of the kind which the Senator has made, in view of the report of the National Resources Committee, a committee which was appointed by the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I have in my hand a copy of the report. It is entitled "Consumer Expenditures in the United States." It is one of the most interesting books which it has been my good fortune to read, and it was prepared with money appropriated by the Congress. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky said that we must approve the proposed loan because we need a great deal of trade. He has said that we will produce many articles for which we will not have any market, and therefore we must make the loan in order to provide a market. I ask the distinguished Senator whether he has examined the report of the committee appointed by the late President Roosevelt. The committee made a report on the 31st day of March 1939, only a short time before the outbreak of World War II. The report shows as of that date, March 31, 1939, the yearly income of 2,123,534 families. Mr. President, do you know how much income those individual families had for the entire year? They had \$140.39. I repeat, Mr. President, \$140.39. That sum represented the income upon which each of those families in the United States was required to live on the date of March 31, 1939.

I have the report here before me in case any Senator who is anxious to have the pending measure passed, wishes to look at it. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is present because I know that among his constituents were some of the 4,587,377 families who were living on \$387.45 a year. That is not the statement of the senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. President, it is the statement of a committee which was appointed by the late President of the United States.

At the same time there were 5,876,078 families living on \$873.29 a year each. I wish to repeat that statement Mr. President.

On that same day 4,990,995 families were living on an income of \$1,119.08.

On the same day, Mr. President, there were 3,743,428 families living on \$1,362.15 a year.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Do the figures which the Senator is giving apply to an entire family, or to each member of the family?

Mr. LANGER. Per family.

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator repeat those figures?

Mr. LANGER. The first figures which I gave were to the effect that 2,123,534 families were living on an income of \$140.39 per family on March 31, 1939.

Mr. HAWKES. For the entire family?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. In other words, if there were five persons in the family, those five persons were living on an income of \$140.39 per annum?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. How did they live?

Mr. LANGER. I am asking the junior Senator from Kentucky to answer the question. He wishes to give a great sum of money to Great Britain. I ask him how those families lived.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator believe that the figures which he has quoted could be accurate? It is inconceivable to me that anyone could subsist on such an income as the Senator has stated.

Mr. LANGER. Here are the figures, and here is the report.

Mr. HAWKES. I would want to check the figures in the report. I would wish to have some agency which understood what it was doing check the report and make a report on its own account. It is inconceivable to me that a family of four or five persons could live on a hundred-and-some-odd dollars a year. It must seem so to the Senator from North Dakota. I know the United States from one end to the other, but I cannot conceive of families even surviving on such an income.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to make it plain to the distinguished Senator

from New Jersey, I am going to read just what the committee appointed by President Roosevelt said. The United States Government paid for this committee, and presumably they were fully advised, for they made a national investigation. Here is where I obtained the figures for these families. I read now from page 121 of the report on Consumer Expenditures in the United States:

Expenditure data were collected in the Study of Consumer Purchases from nonrelief families living in the 51 cities, 140 villages, and 66 farm counties listed in section 2 of this appendix. The number of sample cases that were used in constructing the family patterns—

#### Not individuals—

presented in this report are summarized by income level and type of community in table 1B. This table also summarizes the sample data utilized for single individuals of each sex.

Within each of the communities sampled in the Study of Consumer Purchases, the data were collected and recorded for families in each of five to seven family type groups and, in all except the farm units, were further subdivided into six occupational groups. In the southern communities sampled and in two of the North Central cities—New York City and Columbus, Ohio—separate tabulations of expenditure data were made for Negro as well as for white families, with the same subclassifications listed above. In southern farm units separate samples were obtained for both Negro and white operators and sharecroppers, with the further subclassification by family type.

I repeat this is a report made by a committee appointed by the President of the United States and paid for out of funds provided by Congress in 1937 or 1938.

I confess I was just as much shocked as was my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey, when I first read it. It seemed unbelievable to me that 2,123,534 families on March 1, 1939, had only \$140.39 a year to live on.

At the same time in the United States 1,254,076 families were living on an income of \$2,367.58.

Of course, we also have the other side of the picture. We had at that time 5,387 families that had a yearly income of \$184,804.90. They were the people on the top, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this summarization prepared by Mr. Henry J. Sutton, compiled from table 13-C on page 189 of Consumers Expenditures in the United States, as submitted to the President by the National Resources Committee March 31, 1939, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



## Comparative income distributions (1935-36)—a study—prepared by Henry J. Sutton

[Compiled from table 13C on p. 189 of Consumers Expenditures in the United States, as submitted to the President by the National Resources Committee, Mar. 31, 1936]

Income level groups	Consumer number	Units (per cent)	Aggregate amount	Income (percent)	Average income			
					Yearly	Weekly	Daily	Hourly
Total, all groups.....	39,458,300	100.00	\$29,258,628,000	100.00	\$1,501.80	\$28.88	\$4.81	\$0.60
\$100,000 and over.....	5,387	.01	1,095,544,000	1.84	184,804.90	3,544.01	592.34	74.04
Leaving.....	39,452,913	99.99	58,163,084,000	98.16	1,474.24	28.35	4.72	.59
\$50,000 to \$100,000.....	13,041	.03	908,485,000	1.70	69,740.43	1,341.16	223.53	27.94
Leaving.....	39,439,872	99.96	57,254,599,000	96.46	1,451.69	27.91	4.65	.58
\$40,000 to \$50,000.....	8,340	.02	390,311,000	.66	46,801.08	900.02	150.00	18.75
Leaving.....	39,431,532	99.94	56,864,288,000	95.80	1,442.10	27.73	4.62	.58
\$30,000 to \$40,000.....	17,959	.04	641,272,000	1.08	35,707.36	686.68	114.45	14.31
Leaving.....	39,413,573	99.90	56,213,016,000	94.72	1,426.48	27.43	4.57	.57
\$25,000 to \$30,000.....	25,583	.06	720,268,000	1.21	28,154.16	541.43	90.24	11.28
Leaving.....	39,387,990	99.84	55,502,748,000	93.51	1,409.13	27.10	4.52	.57
\$20,000 to \$25,000.....	39,825	.10	889,114,000	1.50	22,300.44	428.85	71.49	8.94
Leaving.....	39,348,165	99.74	54,613,634,000	92.01	1,387.70	26.69	4.45	.56
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	67,923	.17	1,174,574,000	1.98	17,297.15	332.64	55.44	6.93
Leaving.....	39,280,242	99.57	53,439,060,000	90.03	1,360.45	26.16	4.36	.55
\$10,000 to \$15,000.....	152,682	.39	1,746,925,000	2.94	11,442.24	220.05	36.69	4.59
Leaving.....	39,127,560	99.18	51,692,135,000	87.09	1,321.12	25.41	4.24	.53
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	215,642	.54	1,847,820,000	3.11	8,573.57	164.88	27.48	3.44
Leaving.....	38,911,918	98.64	49,844,315,000	84.98	1,280.95	24.64	4.11	.51
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	380,268	.96	2,244,406,000	3.70	5,902.20	113.52	18.92	2.37
Leaving.....	38,531,652	97.68	47,599,909,000	80.28	1,235.34	23.75	3.96	.50
\$4,500 to \$5,000.....	178,138	.45	841,766,000	1.42	4,725.87	90.88	15.15	1.89
Leaving.....	38,353,514	97.23	46,758,143,000	78.86	1,219.13	23.44	3.91	.49
\$4,000 to \$4,500.....	286,053	.77	1,202,826,000	2.02	4,204.91	80.84	13.44	1.68
Leaving.....	38,067,461	96.46	45,555,317,000	76.84	1,170.43	22.51	3.75	.47
\$3,500 to \$4,000.....	502,159	1.27	1,863,384,000	3.11	3,710.74	71.36	11.89	1.49
Leaving.....	37,565,302	95.19	43,691,933,000	73.73	1,163.09	22.37	3.73	.47
\$3,000 to \$3,500.....	851,919	2.41	2,735,487,000	4.61	3,210.97	60.58	10.10	1.26
Leaving.....	36,713,383	92.78	40,956,446,000	69.12	1,115.56	21.45	3.59	.45
\$2,500 to \$3,000.....	1,475,474	3.75	4,004,774,000	6.75	2,714.22	52.20	8.70	1.09
Leaving.....	35,237,909	89.04	36,951,672,000	62.37	1,040.12	20.00	3.33	.42
\$2,250 to \$2,500.....	1,254,076	3.18	2,968,932,000	5.01	2,367.58	45.53	7.59	.95
Leaving.....	33,983,833	85.56	33,982,740,000	57.36	999.97	19.23	3.21	.40
\$2,000 to \$2,250.....	1,704,535	4.32	3,602,861,000	6.08	2,113.07	40.65	6.78	.85
Leaving.....	32,279,298	81.54	30,379,879,000	51.28	941.15	18.10	3.02	.38
\$1,750 to \$2,000.....	2,296,022	5.82	4,214,203,000	7.11	1,835.43	35.30	5.88	.74
Leaving.....	29,983,276	75.98	26,165,676,000	44.17	869.78	16.72	2.79	.35
\$1,500 to \$1,750.....	2,889,904	7.32	4,660,793,000	7.87	1,616.24	31.25	5.21	.67
Leaving.....	27,093,372	68.66	21,504,883,000	36.30	793.73	15.26	2.54	.32
\$1,250 to \$1,500.....	3,743,428	9.49	5,109,112,000	8.62	1,362.15	26.20	4.32	.54
Leaving.....	23,349,944	59.18	16,395,771,000	27.68	701.79	13.50	2.30	.29
\$1,000 to \$1,250.....	4,990,995	12.65	5,589,111,000	9.43	1,119.08	21.52	3.59	.49
Leaving.....	18,358,949	46.53	10,806,660,000	18.25	588.14	11.31	1.89	.24
\$750 to \$1,000.....	5,876,078	14.89	5,129,506,000	8.66	873.29	16.79	2.80	.35
Leaving.....	12,482,871	31.64	5,677,154,000	9.59	454.96	8.86	1.48	.19
\$500 to \$750.....	5,771,960	14.62	3,615,653,000	6.11	626.42	12.05	2.01	.25
Leaving.....	6,710,911	17.01	2,061,501,000	3.48	307.29	5.91	.99	.13
\$250 to \$500.....	4,587,377	11.63	1,767,363,000	2.99	387.45	7.53	1.42	.18
Under \$250.....	2,123,534	5.38	294,138,000	.50	140.39	2.70	.35	.04½

Mr. LANGER. Now Mr. President, it is proposed to lend \$4,000,000,000 to Great Britain. In 1940 when World War II started the total income tax, made up of all the income taxes paid by everybody in the entire United States, was only \$2,129,609,307, or approximately \$2,000,000,000 if at that time under prewar conditions, we had doubled the income tax for every man, woman, and child in the United States, the revenue from that source would have just about taken care of this loan to England.

If the majority of the Senate wants to do it, that is their privilege, but I want everybody in the United States to know

that so long as I am a Member of this body I shall never vote for a fantastic proposition of that kind. If in England people are hungry, if they are starving, I am perfectly willing to appropriate money to see that they are fed; I am perfectly willing to do that for any country on the face of this earth.

That, Mr. President, brings me to the meeting held in Constitution Hall night before last. It brings me to the report in the New York Times of yesterday morning by former President Hoover concerning conditions in Germany. I checked what the former President said. I found that the London Economist of

August 28, 1945, one of the most brilliantly edited newspapers in the world, stated in its leading editorial:

There is no other cure for the German sore on the body of Europe than to heal it.

There could not be a simpler or clearer expression of the convictions of the vast majority of the American people than this statement by British editors. The Economist concludes the same editorial with the following indictment:

The conviction that the peace proposal at Potsdam is a thoroughly bad peace is not based on any sentimental softening toward Germany. It is based upon the belief that

the system proposed is unworkable. It offers no hope of ultimate German reconciliation. It offers little hope of the Allies maintaining its cumbersome controls beyond the first years of peace. Its methods of reparations reinforce autarchy in Russia and consummate the ruin not only of Germany but of Europe. Above all it has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the postwar world. At the end of a mighty war to defeat Hitlerism the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace.

That is from the London Economist of August 28, 1945. Surely the London Economist is not a pro-Nazi newspaper.

But, Mr. President, there is an overwhelming mass of convincing evidence to demonstrate that, in spite of this basic conviction and attitude on the part of the vast majority of the American people toward Germany, that the only way to cure the German sore on the body of Europe is to heal it. Mr. Morgenthau now stands convicted before the conscience of the world as the instigator of a plan of systematic annihilation of the German-speaking peoples. The record further proves, beyond any question of a doubt, that these fanatical and reactionary high priests of hate and vengeance will never be able to defend their conspiracy before the bar of human reason or human decency.

At this very moment millions of our fellow beings including the aged, women and children, infants and children yet unborn, among the innocent and guilty alike, are suffering the tortures of the damned, not only because Mr. Morgenthau and his henchmen have so largely succeeded in putting their Hitlerian policies of extermination into effect but also because, with utmost contempt, they have ignored or obstructed every attempt to provide constructive alternatives to their un-American and un-Christian experiment in mass murder.

Mr. President, these are not empty or irresponsible charges on my part. The ghastly record of what has already transpired, so far as Mr. Morgenthau and his followers are concerned, is self-incriminating. Slowly but surely the accumulation of this record fits into a sinister pattern.

In the first place, Mr. Morgenthau has never spoken for the vast majority of American people. He has consistently and persistently ignored, suppressed, misinterpreted, and thwarted the basic concerns of the American people for the ultimate treatment of their former enemies. Mr. Morgenthau has displayed nothing but the utmost contempt for the warnings, the appeals, and the findings of America's military leaders, labor leaders, statesmen, and churchmen who have joined in an ever-rising chorus of bitter protest from every corner of this land.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, although until former President Herbert Hoover reported on it the other day we saw little of it in the press, how German women and little infants, born and unborn, are being slowly starved to death in Germany under the Morgenthau plan.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] said a few moments ago that we have to make this loan because we have to take care of our trade. On this floor yesterday

the statement was made time and time again that the real reason for making the loan was that we had to have trade with foreign countries, particularly England.

Mr. President, the most prosperous year the United States has had in all its history was 1929. I hold in my hand a Brookings Institution report. Surely, no matter how prejudiced any man may be in favor of this loan, there is not anyone within the sound of my voice, no Senator upon this floor, who would say that a Brookings Institution report is not reliable. What does the Brookings Institution report say? This was published in the World-Telegram of September 8, 1934, by the Associated Press:

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Despite evidences of overproduction in this country, the Brookings Institution reported today its studies showed the United States cannot yet produce "more than the American people would like to consume."

We do not need the trade with England, Mr. President. We are interested in feeding the millions of American families, constituting a large segment of our population, who in 1931 had an income of about \$1,000 a year. They will take care of all the so-called surplus we used to hear so much about, and which, under the leadership of the Democratic Party, was not saved. The Democratic Party plowed under wheat, and plowed under cotton, and now, some of the leaders who used to sit in this Chamber quoting the Bible find that through their inefficiency and incompetency there is a great shortage. When they were in power they told us in North Dakota not to plant wheat, and they limited the number of acres a farmer could plant. I was Governor of my State and I campaigned in 12 States against that iniquitous, horrible doctrine preached by some of the great leaders of the opposition party on the other side of the aisle. But they kept on plowing under every third row of cotton, and keeping the farmer in the West from producing grain. We find the Brookings Institution at that very time saying that "the United States cannot yet produce more than the American people would like to consume."

I quote further from this news article:

The institution—

That is, the Brookings Institution—

an independent economic research agency, said the wants of the Nation are "large enough to absorb a productive output many times that achieved in the peak year 1929."

The Brookings Institution said that if we had planted every acre on which wheat could be raised in North Dakota and the Northwest, there would still have been an enormous shortage.

"The study indicates," the Brookings Institution added, "that even a relatively minor increase in family incomes would be sufficient to create a consumptive demand in excess of the potential productive capacity of the country in 1929."

I dare say that is correct, Mr. President, when more than 2,000,000 families were living on \$140 a year. The Brookings Institution continued:

"We cannot materially shorten the working day and still produce the quantity of

goods and services which the American people aspire to consume. The actual production of 1929 was accomplished on an industrial workweek which averaged close to 51 hours."

Mr. President, we pride ourselves upon a 40-hour week. At that time there was a 51-hour week.

"If, as has been suggested, the working week were to be shortened to 30 hours, with a view of absorbing all complete and partial unemployment, production would be greatly reduced below the 1929 level."

So, Mr. President, I maintain that this irrefutable statement answers the arguments made by my colleagues on the Democratic side who spoke in behalf of this loan. They said we had to make this loan in order to take care of our trade—our exports—7 percent and 11 percent. We all heard the figures—and heard them again this morning from the distinguished Senator from Kentucky—when the fact is, according to the Brookings Institution, that if we raised many times what we raised in 1929 we will still not be able to take care of the consumers of the United States of America.

Mr. President, there are millions of people who could not afford to buy an automobile in 1939. There were millions of people who on \$140 a year could not afford a radio, could not afford a washing machine, could not afford innumerable things, and I say they comprised nearly a third of our population, according to the committee appointed by President Roosevelt himself, who, on an income of \$1,040 a year, were struggling along, and, of course, on that kind of an income they could not buy automobiles.

Mr. President, I am interested in knowing how many of these poor families will, a year from now or 2 years or 3 years or 4 years from now, be the families of our war veterans, some of whom are sitting in the Senate galleries today. Those boys who went all out and offered the sacrifice of their own lives in behalf of their country when they come back home cannot even get a decent loan.

As long as I live, Mr. President, I shall be proud of one act of mine in this body, and that is that immediately after war was declared I rose on this floor and said that the pay of the private soldier should be at least \$100 a month. Yet when we came to vote on the question, the former distinguished Senator from Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, one of the organizers of, and former national commander of the American Legion, was the only one who supported me in the position I took at that particular time. It is rather good to go back over the record once in a while, Mr. President. That is why I am interested in what is taking place in Iran and Iraq, as well as in Korea, about which the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so eloquently spoke a few moments ago. It is interesting to note that the money we appropriated for lend-lease bought planes which are flying over Java, killing some of the poor people there who were working for 7 cents a day. It is interesting to note that the people of India, who are being kept in subjugation, receive an average income of only about \$18 a year.



Mr. President, from 1942 on, Mr. Morgenthau has deliberately refused to co-operate with, or even to respect real American public opinion. Beginning with 1942, a bitter rivalry developed between Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hull and their supporters in the Treasury, War, and State Departments, respectively, concerning our American objectives in Germany.

In 1943 a group of American representatives joined with representatives of the British Government on the basis of a rational and decent approach to the German problem—so here now we have Americans and Britons working together, Mr. President—which promised the development of a real policy of reconciliation and reconversion of the German nation to democratic ways. Yet, the creative solution offered by this joint group who lived and worked together over these problems for nearly 2 years, was deliberately thrown into the discard, through the influence of Mr. Morgenthau and his fellow travelers in this Government.

In the same year, the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture was called upon by President Roosevelt to—take all necessary steps to develop world food production so that it will be adequate to meet the essential nutritional needs of the world population. And they must see to it that no hindrances, whether of international trade, or transportation, or of internal distribution be allowed to prevent any nation or any group of citizens within a nation, from obtaining the food necessary for health.

That is what President Roosevelt told the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, which was called by himself, that they—

Must see to it that no hindrances, whether of international trade, or transportation, or of internal distribution be allowed to prevent any nation, or any group of citizens within a nation from obtaining the food necessary for health.

President Roosevelt never dreamed that there would be 15,000,000 women and little children starving to death in Germany. He appointed this group, as he said, to prevent such a catastrophe from taking place.

The members of this conference went even so far as to warn of the necessity of continued food rationing for 2 years following the end of the war if a world famine was to be averted. That is what that conference reported, Mr. President, that there would have to be 2 years of rationing of food.

One would think, Mr. President, that Mr. Morgenthau, whose avowed interest and sole purpose, at least as he has represented his intentions, has been to create a pastoral Germany, would have heeded in some degree the joint recommendations of this international committee of experts, which included our own American authorities in that field.

In June 1943 the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation was organized. In describing the task that confronted him as its director, Mr. Herbert Lehman, stated that:

The problem is to devise means to harness world production, already greatly taxed by

war needs, to total world want during the coming months of tremendous human crises. We must see to it that relief flows smoothly and swiftly into measures to remove the need of relief, and that rehabilitation measures are so devised as to enable the suffering nations to begin their own reconstruction at the earliest possible moment. Our objective is to help people to help themselves and thereby to help ourselves, by making possible a world in which the "four freedoms" can have a chance of realization.

That is the same Herbert Lehman, Mr. President, who on night before last at Constitution Hall criticized the majority party, criticized the President of the United States, and said that the way the food has been handled was, to put it mildly, a disgrace.

It would appear, Mr. President, that Mr. Morgenthau, fully conscious of the tremendous part the German Nation played in our world economy, knowing full well how dependent the other nations of Europe were going to be on the skills, the resources, and the productive capacity of German industry, and knowing full well that UNRRA was not going to be permitted to minister to the terrible needs in the conquered countries, would at least have been given cause to pause twice before going ahead with his savage proposals.

Mr. President, less than 3 months ago, at the time when the appropriations for UNRRA were being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee, I asked the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], "Are the German people, the Austrian people, the Rumanian people, and the people in Poland being taken care of?" I asked that, because, under the UNRRA appropriation no provision is made for Germany or Austria or Rumania. The Senator assured me that, of course, the army of occupation was taking care of those people, but he said, in substance, that if it ever becomes apparent that it is necessary, "I will endorse any appropriation so that there may be no starvation in those countries." I believe Japan was also included when he made that statement.

All through the year 1944, up to the time of the Quebec Conference, Mr. Morgenthau continued his violent antagonism to the State Department's plans for a decent peace for Germany. We find Morgenthau fighting Stimson. We find him fighting Hull. As shown by his violent antagonism, we find him fighting the State Department's plans for a decent peace for Germany.

On January 20, 1945, the late President appointed Judge Samuel Rosenman as his personal representative, with the rank of minister, to study food requirements for Europe during the winter and spring of 1945. His report was published in September 1945 although it was made available to the President on April 26, 6 months earlier. Judge Rosenman stated in that report that:

From the point of view of our own United States economy, it is obvious that unless northwest Europe again resumes its place in the international exchange of goods and services, the American economy will be deep-

ly affected. Furthermore, a chaotic and hungry Europe is not fertile ground in which stable, democratic, and friendly governments can be reared.

Yet it is perfectly obvious, Mr. President, that following his usual custom, and knowing full well of the relation, not only between industry and agriculture within the German economy, but also of the relation between the German economy and the economy of Europe, Mr. Morgenthau refused to pay any attention whatsoever to this report.

Mr. Morgenthau time and again has insinuated that he was speaking for the late President when he advocated his inhuman policies toward Germany. Probably no greater misrepresentation could be foisted on the American people. Rather, the truth is that as late as March 10, 1945, the document CJ 1067, over which the State Department had so laboriously worked for 2 years, and which in direct contrast to Mr. Morgenthau's deliberate policies of extermination, incorporated a genuinely humane, creative and American approach to the German problem, was presented at an interdepartmental meeting held in the State Department under the chairmanship of Mr. Stettinius.

The truth is, Mr. President, that this document at that time bore the initials of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, signifying his hearty approval. Yet Mr. Morgenthau, when confronted with these sane and creative alternatives to his own brutal plans, turned livid with rage and forced their repudiation.

On April 30, 1945, the Interagency Committee on Foreign Shipments, which had been appointed by the then Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Mr. James F. Byrnes, issued a report on the world food situation. In this report Mr. Leo T. Crowley stated:

It was agreed that the people of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada are fully prepared to make necessary sacrifices to prevent widespread starvation.

Let me call attention again to the date of that report. Today people are starving. On April 30, 1945, nearly a year ago—

It was agreed that the people of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada are fully prepared to make necessary sacrifices to prevent widespread starvation.

So, Mr. President, I hang the mantle of incompetency, inefficiency, and willful starvation of the peoples of the world on the shoulders of the Democratic Party. Let them face the issue. They and they alone have had a majority in the Senate, which could do anything that it wished in the line of policy. If people are starving today in foreign countries, I want the people of the United States to know that the Democratic Party, the very party which is now trying to give away \$4,000,000,000 more, is the party responsible for hunger, suffering, and starvation in almost every country on the face of the globe.

Yet Mr. Morgenthau continued unmoved in his fanatical determination to destroy the German economy in spite of these warnings that even the vast resources and facilities of the United

States, Great Britain, and Canada would be taxed beyond their limits to prevent a world hunger crisis.

Last September, a group of distinguished American economists, under the direction of Dr. Calvin B. Hoover, made an exhaustive analysis of the inevitable effect on the German economy of Mr. Morgenthau's vicious directives.

This report warned that the German people would not be able to arrive at even the minimum level of existence contemplated by Mr. Morgenthau for at least 5 years, and strongly recommended the production of 10,000,000 tons of steel annually and the retention of at least enough German industry to meet her minimum requirements.

The report stated that it would be 5 years before the Germans could begin to feed themselves. That was stated by a distinguished group of American economists under the direction of Dr. Calvin B. Hoover. This group strongly recommended the production of 10,000,000 tons of steel annually and the retention of at least enough German industry to meet her minimum requirements. I want Senators to remember what was said by Dr. Hoover and his group of economists as I proceed.

Yet Mr. Morgenthau and his radical robots in the Foreign Economic Administration deliberately sabotaged that report, revising the figure of 10,000,000 tons of steel down to 3,000,000 and insisting that the bulk of Germany industry be liquidated.

In the same month, on September 27, 1945, a detailed plan for the industrial control of Germany was made public by the National Engineers' Committee of the engineers' joint council. The plan was developed by 35 outstanding American engineers commissioned for the task by the five major engineering societies in this country.

Let me repeat that. This was not some irresponsible group. The plan was developed by 35 outstanding American engineers commissioned for the work by five major engineering societies in this country. Their report, *The Industrial Disarmament of Aggressor States*, was undertaken with the approval of the War Department and at the invitation of the State Department. This plan, by confining industrial control to power sources and to key industries and strategic raw materials, would require only a 5-percent shift in German employment and would safely permit the nonwar potential portion of German industry to function. This report which represents 7 months' work on the control of German industry hit at the so-called Morgenthau plan for Germany as unwise, impracticable, and likely to result in German rearmament.

These 35 engineers said that Morgenthau's plan for Germany was unwise, impractical, and likely to result in German rearmament.

The report further states:

Elimination of German industries leaving agriculture as the sole occupation would produce an economic dislocation and social chaos of destructive magnitude not alone in Germany but throughout Europe.

Mr. President, this report by the National Engineers' Committee contained essentially the same proposals for the treatment of Germany as those of Harold G. Mouldan, head of Brookings Institution, and Mr. Louis Marliot, which they developed in their book *The Control of Germany and Japan*. These authors presented a perfectly simple plan to control the German and Japanese economies which did not necessitate a destructive policy of deindustrialization. They justified their proposals by illustrating from history humanity's past experience in the disarmament of defeated nations, which is something Mr. Morgenthau would never have been able to do to lack up his savage plan.

Yet Mr. Morgenthau continued to pay no attention whatsoever to the findings and recommendations of these American experts.

Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall read from several books and I shall show that no matter how cruel England has been in all her history—and I do not even except the Black Hole of Calcutta—there has never been a more vicious, more savage plan of mass murder than the one which has been conceived by Mr. Morgenthau—the Morgenthau plan—for the extermination by starvation of 15,000,000 women, children, and little infants in Germany.

On November 12 it was revealed in *Human Events* that terrifying facts and figures had been compiled by another group of American economic experts who stated that less than 50 percent of Germany is now self-sufficient, and that imports are negligible. The report stated that General Eisenhower's own warning on this subject, made in his September report, was designed to relieve the Army of responsibility for the results of Potsdam and the Morgenthau plan.

In the same week a report on Germany signed by all 18 members of the House committee under the chairmanship of Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, which had returned from a trip to Europe, contained the following warning:

If a hard peace requires the elimination of eight to ten million Germans it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once.

In other words, it would be better to kill, chloroform, shoot, or otherwise get rid of the eight or ten million Germans, said the 18 Members of the House of Representatives only a few moments ago, rather than to carry out the despicable Morgenthau plan.

Mr. President, still Mr. Morgenthau refused to pay the slightest attention to these grim warnings of the criminal consequence of his policy.

On November 26, 1945, 5 months ago, Mr. Frank Mason wired the *New York Times* from Germany that the United States Army officers in the American zone were becoming increasingly vocal in expressing opposition to Mr. Morgenthau's basic thesis which has revived the doctrine of collective guilt and the law of an eye for an eye.

In speaking of Mr. Morgenthau's insistence on the application to the Ger-

man people as a whole of the doctrine of collective responsibility or institutional guilt, whereby every person listed on the membership of an organization is an equal partner in crime, Mr. Mason wrote:

Since it now appears to be the law, they want to know what new principles of military organization are being contemplated by the Congress of the United States to safeguard our career Army officers from continuance as whipping boys of politicians and civilian administrators who give the secret orders for which the Army officers take the public blame. . . . These officers often appear to the world as sponsoring or approving policies in Germany which they privately condemn as un-American.

Mr. Mason went on to reveal that as far back as September 1945, Mr. Morgenthau's personal rubber stamp, Col. Bernard Bernstein, of the Treasury Department, had made such a mess of things by his high-handed and overbearing behavior that he was relieved of his assignment in the middle of September and was placed in charge of the cartel investigation branch of the Army, where he has been using the subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Committee to continue this Morgenthau-Bernstein plan for the extermination of the German people. According to Mr. Mason:

This occurred after criticism from military government officers that Colonel Bernstein appeared to be embarked on a somewhat individual and independent enterprise quite parallel with Mr. Morgenthau's plan. Colonel Bernstein is generally believed around Frankfurt to be a coauthor.

Certainly, Mr. President, Mr. Morgenthau and his supporters do not speak for American Jewry. In the January issue of the *Commentary*, a Jewish review, published by the American Jewish Committee, a publication reflecting the finest expression of Jewish thought in America, Mr. Morgenthau's basic thesis of an eye for an eye and a tooth for tooth is violently repudiated. The article to which I refer is titled "Will Nuremberg Serve Justice?" The author is Milton R. Konvitz, a recognized authority on civil rights and judicial administration. He has written extensively for philosophical, legal, Anglo-Jewish, and literary periodicals. His father was Rabbi Joseph Konvitz, for a generation leader of American orthodox Jews; his grandfather, Rabbi Jacob David, known as Ridvas, was a leading world authority on the Palestinian Talmud. According to this author, Mr. Morgenthau's demand for the letter and the spirit of revenge is rendering the United States and the whole system of international law a criminal disservice. Mr. Konvitz wrote that:

The defendants are charged with crimes against humanity. The charge refers in part to atrocities committed by the Nazis in Germany itself since 1933. It is based on the theory that if a country's legal or political system permits abuse of its population, there is a violation of international law, and the heads of the state are personally liable.

Here again it appears that there is one law for the victor and another for the vanquished. For according to the theory, if the British imprison thousands of Indian nationalists without trial, strafe villagers from airplanes



and impose fines on whole towns, we should bring the emperor of India and his viceroy before an international court. If Russia holds some 8,000,000 persons in concentration camps, without what we regard as due process of law, we have a right to try Stalin, Molotov, and other Russian chiefs of state in some international court.

Mr. President, I wish to depart for a few minutes from the presentation I have been making, and I now wish to refer the Senate to the peace conference which was held at the end of World War I. I hold in my hand a book written by Mr. J. M. Keynes, the same man who was over here a few weeks ago representing England. So far as I know, he may still be here today. So far as I know, he may be sitting in the Senate gallery. I hope he is. I wish to show what that man at that time thought about Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson, who was the President of the United States during World War I, also was fooled. I wonder what my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle think about an Englishman who comes along and insults Woodrow Wilson.

I now read from chapter 3:

In chapters IV and V, I shall study in some detail the economic and financial provisions of the Treaty of Peace with Germany.

Mr. President, I am amazed at some of the great Democratic Senators on the other side of the aisle; I am amazed to hear them saying what a great country is England. Many times yesterday the distinguished majority leader referred to what he considered to be the greatness of England, and, by implication, praised Churchill, and implied that he is a great man.

Mr. President, the Winston Churchill to whom the Senator referred is the same Winston Churchill who so hated the United States of America that during the Spanish-American War he took up arms in behalf of Spain against the United States. He wanted to wipe out the United States of America at that time, and he wants to wipe her out today. As a young man 24 years of age, and as a newspaper reporter in Cuba, he joined the army of Spain in order to fight the United States of America. He is the man, Mr. President, whom the Democratic majority of the United States Senate invited to address the Senate. I wonder what some of the Spanish-American war veterans, whom he tried to kill, thought about it. Churchill was 24 years of age when the Maine was blown up in Habana Harbor. He was there as a press correspondent, and later although he was a Briton, he joined the Spanish Army. Yet the Members of the Senate listened to that cunning hypocrite when he addressed the Senate only a few short months ago. He came to this country after World War I in order to get all the money he could obtain out of the taxpayers of America. Now he is back again. I wish to show you, Mr. President, the utter contempt in which some Englishmen held President Wilson. I wish to read from chapter III of the book which I now hold, a book written by a man who is in this country now, or at least was here a few days ago, in an attempt to obtain a loan of \$4,000,000,000. This is what he said in November 1919,

when the British hides had been saved, and when the British thought it was safe to tell the truth:

I repeat:

In chapters IV and V, I shall study in some detail the economic and financial provisions of the treaty of peace with Germany. But, it will be easier to appreciate the true origin of many of these terms if we examine here some of the personal factors which influenced their preparation.

In attempting this task, I touch, inevitably, questions of motive, on which spectators are liable to error and are not entitled to take on themselves the responsibilities of final judgment. Yet if I seem in this chapter to assume sometimes the liberties which are habitual to historians, but which, in spite of the greater knowledge with which we speak, we generally hesitate to assume toward contemporaries, let the reader excuse me when he remembers how greatly, if it is to understand its destiny, the world needs light, even if it is partial and uncertain, on the complex struggle of human will and purpose, not yet finished, which, concentrated in the persons of four individuals in a manner never paralleled, made them, in the first months of 1919, the microcosm of mankind.

(At this point, Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. MORSE to make a unanimous consent request, and debate ensued, which appears at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's remarks for the day.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Keynes is in this country, or at least has been here, in an effort to obtain a loan from the United States of approximately \$4,000,000,000. He sizes up four men who wrote the treaty of peace following World War I. He states as follows:

In those parts of the treaty with which I am here concerned, the lead was taken by the French, in the sense that it was generally they who made in the first instance the most definite and most extreme proposals. This was partly a matter of tactics.

Mr. President, we thought that Woodrow Wilson went to Europe in order to put over his 14 points, but this Englishman says that that is all a myth, that the leading part was taken by the French.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remainder of pages 28, 29, and 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the final result is expected to be a compromise, it is often prudent to start from an extreme position; and the French anticipated at the outset—like most other persons—a double process of compromise, first of all to suit the ideas of their allies and associates, and secondly in the course of the peace conference proper with the Germans themselves. These tactics were justified by the event. Clemenceau gained a reputation for moderation with his colleagues in council by sometimes throwing over with an air of intellectual impartiality the more extreme proposals of his ministers; and much went through where the American and British critics were naturally a little ignorant of the true point at issue, or where too persistent criticism by France's allies put them in a position which they felt as invidious, of always appearing to take the enemy's part and to argue his case. Where, therefore, British and American interests were not seriously involved their criticism grew slack, and

some provisions were thus passed which the French themselves did not take very seriously, and for which the eleventh-hour decision to allow no discussion with the Germans removed the opportunity of remedy.

But, apart from tactics, the French had a policy. Although Clemenceau might curiously abandon the claims of a Klotz or a Loucheur, or close his eyes with an air of fatigue when French interests were no longer involved in the discussion, he knew which points were vital, and these he abated little. Insofar as the main economic lines of the Treaty represent an intellectual idea, it is the idea of France and of Clemenceau.

Clemenceau was by far the most eminent member of the Council of Four, and he had taken the measure of his colleagues. He alone both had an idea and had considered it in all its consequences. His age, his character, his wit, and his appearance joined to give him objectivity and a defined outline in an environment of confusion. One could not despise Clemenceau or dislike him, but only take a different view as to the nature of civilized man, or indulge, at least, a different hope.

The figure and bearing of Clemenceau are universally familiar. At the Council of Four he wore a square-tailed coat of very good, thick black broadcloth, and on his hands, which were never uncovered, gray suede gloves; his boots were of thick black leather, very good, but of a country style, and sometimes fastened in front, curiously, by a buckle instead of laces. His seat in the room in the President's house, where the regular meetings of the Council of Four were held (as distinguished from their private and unattended conferences in a smaller chamber below) was on a square brocaded chair in the middle of the semicircle facing the fireplace, with Signor Orlando on his left, the President next by the fireplace, and the Prime Minister opposite on the other side of the fireplace on his right. He carried no papers and no portfolio, and was unattended by any personal secretary, though several French ministers and officials appropriate to the particular matter in hand would be present round him. His walk, his hand, and his voice were not lacking in vigor, but he bore, nevertheless, especially after the attempt upon him, the aspect of a very old man conserving his strength for important occasions. He spoke seldom, leaving the initial statement of the French case to his ministers or officials; he closed his eyes often and sat back in his chair with an impassive face of parchment, his gray-gloved hands clasped in front of him. A short sentence, decisive or cynical, was generally sufficient, a question, an unqualified abandonment of his ministers, whose face would not be saved, or a display of obstinacy reinforced by a few words in a piquantly delivered English. But speech and passion were not lacking when they were wanted, and the sudden outburst of words, often followed by a fit of deep coughing from the chest, produced their impression rather by force and surprise than by persuasion.

Mr. LANGER. I read:

Not infrequently Mr. Lloyd George, after delivering a speech in English, would, during the period of its interpretation into French, cross the hearthrug to the President—

That was President Wilson—

to reinforce his case by some ad hominem argument in private conversation, or to sound the ground for a compromise—and this would sometimes be the signal for a general upheaval and disorder. The President's advisers would press round him, a moment later the British experts would dribble across to learn the result or see that all was well, and next the French would be there, a little suspicious lest the others were arranging

something behind them, until all the room were on their feet and conversation was general in both languages. My last and most vivid impression is of such a scene—the President and the Prime Minister as the center of a surging mob and a babel of sound, a welter of eager impromptu compromises and counter-compromises, all sound and fury signifying nothing, on what was an unreal question anyhow, the great issues of the morning's meeting forgotten and neglected; and Clemenceau silent and aloof on the outskirts—for nothing which touched the security of France was forward—throned, in his gray gloves, on the brocade chair, dry in soul and empty of hope, very old and tired, but surveying the scene with a cynical and almost impish air; and when at last silence was restored and the company had returned to their places, it was to discover that he had disappeared.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD pages 34, 35, 36, and all of page 37 down to the last paragraph.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In spite, therefore, of France's victorious issue from the present struggle (with the aid, this time, of England and America), her future position remained precarious in the eyes of one who took the view that European civil war is to be regarded as a normal, or at least a recurrent, state of affairs for the future, and that the sort of conflicts between organized great powers which have occupied the past 100 years will also engage the next. According to this vision of the future, European history is to be a perpetual prize fight, of which France has won this round, but of which this round is certainly not the last. From the belief that essentially the old order does not change, being based on human nature which is always the same, and from a consequent skepticism of all that class of doctrine which the League of Nations stands for, the policy of France and of Clemenceau followed logically. For a peace of magnanimity or of fair and equal treatment, based on such "ideology" as the Fourteen Points of the President, could only have the effect of shortening the interval of Germany's recovery and hastening the day when she will once again hurl at France her greater numbers and her superior resources and technical skill. Hence the necessity of guarantees; and each guaranty that was taken, by increasing irritation and thus the probability of a subsequent revanche by Germany, made necessary yet further provisions to crush. Thus, as soon as this view of the world is adopted and the other discarded, a demand for a Carthaginian peace is inevitable, to the full extent of the momentary power to impose it. For Clemenceau made no pretense of considering himself bound by the Fourteen Points and left chiefly to others such concoctions as were necessary from time to time to save the scruples or the face of the President.

So far as possible, therefore, it was the policy of France to set the clock back and to undo what, since 1870, the progress of Germany had accomplished. By loss of territory and other measures her population was to be curtailed; but chiefly the economic system, upon which she depended for her new strength, the vast fabric built upon iron, coal, and transport must be destroyed. If France could seize, even in part, what Germany was compelled to drop, the inequality of strength between the two rivals for European hegemony might be remedied for many generations.

Hence sprang those cumulative provisions for the destruction of highly organized eco-

nomic life which we shall examine in the next chapter.

This is the policy of an old man, whose most vivid impressions and most lively imagination are of the past and not of the future. He sees the issue in terms of France and Germany, not of humanity and of European civilization struggling forward to a new order. The war has bitten into his consciousness somewhat differently from ours, and he neither expects nor hopes that we are at the threshold of a new age.

It happens, however, that it is not only an ideal question that is at issue. My purpose in this book is to show that the Carthaginian peace is not practically right or possible. Although the school of thought from which it springs is aware of the economic factor, it overlooks, nevertheless, the deeper economic tendencies which are to govern the future. The clock cannot be set back. You cannot restore Central Europe to 1870 without setting up such strains in the European structure and letting loose such human and spiritual forces as, pushing beyond frontiers and races, will overwhelm not only you and your guaranties, but your institutions, and the existing order of your society.

By what legerdemain was this policy substituted for the Fourteen Points, and how did the President come to accept it? The answer to these questions is difficult and depends on elements of character and psychology and on the subtle influence of surroundings, which are hard to detect and harder still to describe. But, if ever the action of a single individual matters, the collapse of the President has been one of the decisive moral events of history; and I must make an attempt to explain it. What a place the President held in the hearts and hopes of the world when he sailed to us in the *George Washington*. What a great man came to Europe in those early days of our victory.

**Mr. LANGER.** Mr. President, this is what Keynes thought of President Wilson. Keynes is the fellow who is here now trying to get \$4,000,000,000 from our taxpayers. This is what he said:

In November 1918, the armies of Foch and the words of Wilson had brought us sudden escape from what was swallowing up all we cared for. The conditions seemed favorable beyond any expectation. The victory was so complete that fear need play no part in the settlement. The enemy had laid down his arms in reliance on a solemn compact as to the general character of the peace, the terms of which seemed to assure a settlement of justice and magnanimity, and a fair hope for a restoration of the broken current of life. To make assurance certain the President was coming himself to set the seal on his work.

When President Wilson left Washington he enjoyed a prestige and a moral influence throughout the world unequaled in history. His bold and measured words carried to the peoples of Europe above and beyond the voices of their own politicians. The enemy peoples trusted him to carry out the compact he had made with them; and the Allied peoples acknowledged him not as a victor only but almost as a prophet. In addition to this moral influence the realities of power were in his hands. The American armies were at the height of their numbers, discipline, and equipment.

Mr. President, I mention that because we are in that very shape at the present time. In a little while these same English will be making fun of Mr. Truman. If they get this \$4,000,000,000 they will be ridiculing him and making fun of him. I repeat:

The American armies were at the height of their numbers, discipline, and equipment.

Europe was in complete dependence on the food supplies of the United States—

Just as she is today—

And financially she was even more absolutely at their mercy.

Just as Europe is today.

Europe not only already owed the United States more than she could pay—

And that is true today, Mr. President—but only a large measure of further assistance could save her from starvation and bankruptcy.

The only difference is that they are already bankrupt. England last year had a deficit of \$4,000,000,000. They are already broke. They are already a third-rate power, unless the United States helps them out. This was the shape they were in after World War I. Keynes said:

Never had a philosopher held such weapons wherewith to bind the princes of this world. How the crowds of the European capitals pressed about the carriage of the President; with what curiosity, anxiety, and hope we sought a glimpse of the features and bearing of the man of destiny who, coming from the West, was to bring healing to the wounds of the ancient parent of this civilization and lay for us the foundations of the future.

He might just as well be speaking about President Truman today, because the situations are identical. This is what this English beggar, Keynes, says about Mr. Wilson:

The disillusion was so complete, that some of those who had trusted most hardly dared speak. Could it be true? they asked of those who returned from Paris. Was the Treaty really as bad as it seemed? What had happened to the President? What weakness or what misfortune had led to so extraordinary, so unlooked-for a betrayal?

Yet the causes were very ordinary and human. The President was not a hero or a prophet; he was not even a philosopher; but a generously intentioned man, with many of the weaknesses of other human beings, and lacking that dominating intellectual equipment which would have been necessary to cope with the subtle and dangerous spellbinders whom a tremendous clash of forces and personalities had brought to the top as triumphant masters in the swift game of give and take, face to face in Council—a game of which he had no experience at all.

Mr. President, that is the shape Mr. Truman is in. Mr. Keynes might just as well be talking of the present President, in what he said of Mr. Wilson after Mr. Wilson had given them all this money. Mr. Keynes said:

We had indeed quite a wrong idea of the President. We knew him to be solitary and aloof, and believed him very strong-willed and obstinate. We did not figure him as a man of detail, but the clearness with which he had taken hold of certain main ideas would, we thought, in combination with his tenacity, enable him to sweep through cobwebs.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. GOSSETT for a statement and then to Mr. MCCARRAN, and debate ensued, which appears at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's remarks for the day.)

**Mr. LANGER.** Mr. President, I continue to read Mr. Keynes' estimate of Mr. Wilson; what he thought of Mr. Wilson. This is the same Mr. Keynes who has been over here seeking a \$4,000,000,000 loan. He wrote this in 1919, right after Great



Britain secured the other billions of dollars, when he thought he was safe, when he thought England did not need any more money, and they were all fixed up for the future. Then Mr. Keynes had a chance to say what he thought about the President, and what did he say? He said:

But if the President was not the philosopher-king, what was he? After all he was a man who had spent much of his life at a university. He was by no means a businessman.

Mr. President, I have heard it said by some of Mr. Truman's enemies that he is not a businessman either. So Mr. Keynes, who had gotten all this money for England from Mr. Wilson, said in the book he wrote, after they had rooked him, that President Wilson was by no means a businessman.

I continue to read:

He was by no means a businessman or an ordinary party politician, but a man of force, personality, and importance. What, then, was his temperament?

The clue once found was illuminating. The President was like a Nonconformist minister, perhaps a Presbyterian. His thought and his temperament was essentially theological not intellectual with all the strength and the weakness of that manner of thought, feeling, and expression. It is a type of which there are not now in England and Scotland such magnificent specimens as formerly; but this description, nevertheless, will give the ordinary Englishman the distinctest impression of the President.

With this picture of him in mind, we can return to the actual course of events.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of page 42, beginning in the middle of the page, all of page 43, and the first 10 lines of page 44, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With this picture of him in mind, we can return to the actual course of events. The President's program for the world, as set forth in his speeches and his notes, and displayed a spirit and a purpose so admirable that the last desire of his sympathizers was to criticize details—the details, they felt, were quite rightly not filled in at present, but would be in due course. It was commonly believed at the commencement of the Paris Conference that the President had thought out, with the aid of a large body of advisers, a comprehensive scheme not only for the League of Nations, but for the embodiment of the Fourteen Points in an actual treaty of peace. But in fact the President had thought out nothing; when it came to practice his ideas were nebulous and incomplete. He had no plan, no scheme, no constructive ideas whatever for clothing with the flesh of life the commandments which he had thundered from the White House. He could have preached a sermon on any of them or have addressed a stately prayer to the Almighty for their fulfillment; but he could not frame their concrete application to the actual state of Europe.

He not only had no proposals in detail, but he was in many respects, perhaps inevitably, ill-informed as to European conditions. And not only was he ill-informed—that was true of Mr. Lloyd George also—but his mind was slow and unadaptable. The President's slowness amongst the Europeans was noteworthy. He could not, all in a minute, take in what the rest were saying, size up the situation with a glance, frame a reply, and meet the

case by a slight change of ground; and he was liable, therefore, to defeat by the mere swiftness, apprehension, and agility of a Lloyd George. There can seldom have been a statesman of the first rank more incompetent than the President in the agilities of the council chamber. A moment often arrives when substantial victory is yours if by some slight appearance of a concession you can save the face of the opposition or conciliate them by a restatement of your proposal helpful to them and not injurious to anything essential to yourself. The President was not equipped with this simple and usual artfulness. His mind was too slow and unresourceful to be ready with any alternatives. The President was capable of digging his toes in and refusing to budge, as he did over Fiume. But he had no other mode of defense, and it needed as a rule but little maneuvering by his opponents to prevent matters from coming to such a head until it was too late.

Mr. LANGER. Now we find what Mr. Keynes has to say about how they fooled the President of the United States, Mr. Wilson.

By pleasantness and the appearance of conciliation—

That is what the Englishmen did to him, when they got poor Mr. Wilson away from home.

By pleasantness and the appearance of conciliation the President would be maneuvered off his ground, would miss the moment for digging his toes in, and, before he knew where he had been got to, it was too late.

They had him.

Besides it is impossible month after month in intimate and ostensibly friendly converse between close associates, to be digging the toes in all the time. Victory would only have been possible to one who had already a sufficiently lively apprehension of the position as a whole to reserve his fire and know for certain the rare exact moment for decisive action, and for that the President was far too slow-minded and bewildered.

So the Englishmen got the money because Wilson was not a businessman, because he was too slow-minded, and because he was bewildered, so says Mr. Keynes, who is now over here trying to get \$4,000,000,000 more.

He did not remedy these defects by seeking aid from the collective wisdom of his lieutenants. He had gathered around him for the economic chapters of the treaty a very able group of businessmen; but they were inexperienced in public affairs.

Mr. President, when I was a young boy in college it happened that I had as one of my professors Woodrow Wilson, afterward President of the United States. Mr. Wilson came to Columbia and gave a series of lectures called the Blumenthal Foundation lectures, and if ever a man had the respect of the students it was Woodrow Wilson.

Yet what do we find on the other side of the aisle? We find that Senators who today are in favor of this loan had Mr. Keynes, the English beggar, come before them. Mr. Keynes is asking for another \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. For what purpose?

Mr. CARVILLE. I wish to submit an amendment to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection, even if the Senator wishes to offer a hundred amendments.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CARVILLE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I have stated, the students at Columbia respected Woodrow Wilson. We knew him to be an outstanding citizen of the country. Yet this is what we find Mr. Keynes saying about him. I read from page 44 of Mr. Keynes' book:

Victory would only have been possible to one who had always a sufficiently lively apprehension of the position as a whole to reserve his fire and know for certain the rare exact moments for decisive action. And for that the President was far too slow-minded and bewildered.

He did not remedy these defects by seeking aid from the collective wisdom of his lieutenants. He had gathered around him for the economic chapters of the treaty a very able group of businessmen; but they were inexperienced in public affairs, and knew (with one or two exceptions) as little of Europe as he did, and they were only called in irregularly as he might need them for a particular purpose. Thus the aloofness which had been found effective in Washington was maintained, and the abnormal reserve of his nature did not allow near him anyone who aspired to moral equality or the continuous exercise of influence. His fellow plenipotentiaries were dummies—

That is what this Englishman thought about the men whom Woodrow Wilson had around him. He said they were dummies. The distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], knows what a dummy is.

His fellow plenipotentiaries were dummies, and even the trusted Colonel House, with vastly more knowledge of men and of Europe than the President, from whose sensitiveness the President's dullness had gained so much, fell into the background as time went on. All this was encouraged by his colleagues on the Council of Four, who, by the break-up of the Council of Ten, completed the isolation which the President's own temperament had initiated. Thus day after day and week after week, he allowed himself to be closeted, unsupported, unadvised, and alone, with men much sharper than himself, in situations of supreme difficulty, where he needed for success every description of resource, fertility, and knowledge. He allowed himself to be drugged by their atmosphere, to discuss on the basis of their plans and of their data, and to be led along their paths.

These and other various causes combined to produce the following situation. The reader must remember that the processes which are here compressed into a few pages took place slowly, gradually, insidiously, over a period of about 5 months.

As the President had thought nothing out, the Council was generally working on the basis of a French or British draft. He had to take up, therefore, a persistent attitude of obstruction, criticism, and negation, if the draft was to become at all in line with his own ideas and purposes.

I wish Senators to pay particular attention. I shall show how others "worked" President Wilson when they

got the peace and when they got the money.

If he was met on some points with apparent generosity (for there was always a safe margin of quite preposterous suggestions which no one took seriously), it was difficult for him not to yield on others. Compromise was inevitable, and never to compromise on the essential, very difficult. Besides, he was soon made to appear to be taking the German part and laid himself open to the suggestion (to which he was foolishly and unfortunately sensitive) of being "pro-German."

Mr. Keynes, who is now looking for money over here, said that President Wilson was not a businessman. He said that the men who accompanied President Wilson to Paris were dummies. In addition, Mr. Keynes said that Woodrow Wilson was afraid of being called a pro-German. According to Mr. Keynes himself, that is where they had the poor man.

I continue reading from Mr. Keynes' book:

After a display of much principle and dignity in the early days of the Council of Ten, he discovered that there were certain very important points in the program, of his French, British, or Italian colleague, as the case might be, of which he was incapable of securing the surrender by the methods of secret diplomacy. What, then, was he to do in the last resort? He could let the Conference drag on an endless length by the exercise of sheer obstinacy. He could break it up and return to America in a rage with nothing settled. Or he could attempt an appeal to the world over the heads of the Conference. These were wretched alternatives, against each of which a great deal could be said. They were also very risky, especially for a politician. The President's mistaken policy over the congressional election had weakened his personal position in his own country, and it was by no means certain that the American public would support him in a position of intransigency. It would mean a campaign in which the issues would be clouded by every sort of personal and party consideration, and who could say if right would triumph in a struggle which would certainly not be decided on its merits. Besides, any open rupture with his colleagues would certainly bring upon his head the blind passions of anti-German resentment with which the public of all Allied countries were still inspired. They would not listen to his arguments. They would not be cool enough to treat the issue as one of international morality or of the right governance of Europe. The cry would simply be that, for various sinister and selfish reasons, the President wished "to let the Hun off." The almost unanimous voice of the French and British press could be anticipated. Thus, if he threw down the gage publicly he might be defeated.

That brings me back to the situation in Germany today. As I stated a little while ago, we have Mr. Keynes saying that President Wilson was not a businessman, and the men whom he took over with him as plenipotentiaries were a set of dummies. We find him helpless and isolated, surrounded by men trained in diplomacy—the Italians, the English, and the French. Then we have Mr. Keynes saying that if he dared to rebel he would be called pro-German.

Coming back to the statement of Mr. Konvitz:

Our policy with respect to the Nazis is inconsistent with neither international law nor our own State Department's policy.

In other words, before Germany was whipped President Roosevelt said one thing. After she was whipped Mr. Morgenthau came along with something entirely different.

The Nuremberg trial constitutes a real threat to the basic conception of justice which it has taken mankind thousands of years to establish. Law is more than power dressed in judicial robes. Law is the only thing that stands between civilization and the jungle. Our scientific discoveries and mechanical inventions, when man is not subject to law, can only make us more beastly creatures. I would sooner see Goering, Hess, Jodl, and the other defendants shot summarily or hanged, or even be permitted to live out their lives in a Doorn (if these were the only alternatives to the Nuremberg trial—which is not at all the situation) than witness the undermining of the legal structure it took us centuries to build up.

Goering and his colleagues would die in any case in another 10 or 20 years. Civilization must go on after them. We have saved civilization from their attack. Their atrocities against civilization, the moral and legal order of mankind, have been ended. We must be on guard now that we ourselves do not weaken our sense of law and our institutions of justice. For if justice is dead, as Kant has said, life is not worth living.

Yet, Mr. President, Mr. Morgenthau not only has been willing to let his thirst for revenge jeopardize the confidence of our own military men in the policies of this Government but he has also been personally responsible for the specific directives which underlie our denazification program in Germany—directives which are so shocking that up to this very moment neither he nor this Government have dared to make them public.

Mr. President, some of the newspapers do not even dare to print the truth about the situation which exists in Germany. Hundreds of magazine writers and hundreds of newspaper reporters would like to have their publications print the truth, because fundamentally the writers and reporters—and I include the fine men and women who sit in our press gallery—would like to tell the truth about the situation. But they know very well that the newspapers will not print it. Undoubtedly, time and time again they have reported it, but for some reason or other the newspapers dare not print it. Mr. President, according to the specific directives which underlie our denazification program in Germany, so I am informed, the German people have been thrown into 134 different categories of guilt, all of which carry a mandatory sentence to hard labor. Membership in over 50 organizations has been decreed a mark of joint guilt in the Nazi crimes against humanity.

Mr. President, it is even more amazing to find in this same issue of this Jewish review the most completely unanswerable and devastating attack on Mr. Morgenthau's book *Germany Is Our Problem* that I have seen in print. Its author, Mr. Gunter Reimann, a recognized authority in the field of international economics, demonstrates beyond all question of doubt that even Mr. Morgenthau's facts and figures are false and misleading. Mr. Reimann charges that:

Germany's territorial losses are actually more than twice as large as the book pre-

mises. Mr. Morgenthau takes account of the loss of Eastern Prussia and Silesia, but does not refer to other, even greater, losses of German territory, millions of whose inhabitants have been deported into rump Germany. (This oversight is particularly strange in view of the fact that the author refers to the Potsdam Conference, at which these territorial changes were discussed.) Thus his figures on the future German deficit of foodstuffs that will result from loss of agricultural territories are quite misleading, and underestimate the deficits in various items of food by from 15 to 35 percent on the average. Mr. Morgenthau habitually gives the postwar population of Germany as 60,000,000 persons living within an agricultural area of about 107,000,000 acres. Actually the population of rump Germany will amount to 5 to 10 million persons more, and the arable land to 15,000,000 acres less.

Mr. President, I should like to have some of the distinguished Democratic leaders on the other side of the aisle answer that, if they can. If they are in favor of the Morgenthau plan, let them rise on the floor of the Senate and say so. I challenge any one of them, the majority leader included, to defend openly and publicly, at a time when the newspapers of America can report the debate, the Morgenthau plan upon the floor of the United States Senate, if they can do so. I say they cannot. I say the majority leader cannot. I say he dare not try to defend it, because if he, the distinguished majority leader, tried to do so, he would be beaten down by arguments based on quotations taken from the writings of some of the leaders of the New Deal. He would be beaten down by directives issued by Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he was at the head of the New Deal in this country.

But all we get is silence, silence, silence, week after week, month after month, because they cannot, they dare not, defend the Morgenthau plan upon the floor of this body.

So, Mr. President, I repeat that Mr. Morgenthau does not tell the truth in his book, when he talks about 60,000,000 persons in Germany living within an agricultural area of about 107,000,000 acres. He does not tell the truth there. Actually, the population of Germany will amount to 5 or 10 million persons more, and the arable land to 15,000,000 acres more.

I now read further quotations from Mr. Reimann's book:

Mr. Morgenthau writes that 34,000 large estates took up more than one-third of the farmland in prewar Germany. As a matter of fact, the 34,000 largest estates, those of 100 or more hectares (247 acres or over), occupied only 11.7 percent of arable land.

Mr. President, those figures do not indicate as bad a situation as that which exists at Greenwich, Conn., where the UN hopes to establish its headquarters. Yet Mr. Morgenthau makes those statements in his book.

I read further from Mr. Reimann:

Mr. Morgenthau claims that German agriculture was backward.

Mr. President, surely that will surprise the farmers of our Northwest, the farmers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and other of our Northwestern States, because we



have been learning a great deal from German agriculture. As a matter of fact, some of the agricultural colleges in that area employ important and outstanding German experts who were imported to the Northwestern part of our country to teach the best methods of farming. Some of our colleges employ Swedish, Dutch, and Finnish experts. They have brought experts there from the four corners of the earth. Yet, Mr. Morgenthau claims that German agriculture was backward.

I read further from Mr. Reimann's book:

Mr. Morgenthau claims that German agriculture was backward. The exact reverse is true. In all Europe only Sweden, Holland, and Belgium had a higher output of grain per acre, and this was largely owing to better soil conditions or greater specialization. All other European countries produced less grain per acre than did Germany.

Mr. Morgenthau claims that there is adequate unused arable land in Germany. It is true that forests and pasture land are still to be found in Germany, although in far smaller proportions than in France, Britain, or most other European countries. Of course, one could institute a program of extensive deforestation in Germany in order to provide more farm land. But one need not be an agricultural expert to predict the dire effects this would have on soil and climatic conditions throughout central Europe.

The author's suggestion that 5,000,000 industrial workers be settled on 2,500,000 new farms in order to increase Germany's total agricultural yield assumes, for one thing, that a skilled metalworker or bookkeeper can become an efficient independent farmer overnight. For another thing, he has no difficulty finding land for these 2,500,000 additional farms. He has somehow discovered plenty of arable wasteland that the highly qualified German agrarian experts simply overlooked. Furthermore, he would break up all large estates. But if all of the 20,000 large estates of 247 acres and over in rump Germany were to be divided into 2,500,000 little farms, each farm would total 2.1 acres. The minimum-size farm that before the war could support a hard-working, efficient, and experienced farmer was 9.9 to 11.3 acres in western Germany and 47.4 to 68.1 acres in eastern Germany. (This was the estimate of Germany's outstanding agricultural expert, Prof. Max Sering, in his standard work published in 1932.)

But, Mr. President, Mr. Morgenthau, instead of using the proven figures of approximately 10 or 11 acres in western Germany and approximately 47 or 58 acres in eastern Germany, would have German farm families live on farms of 2.1 acres.

Besides, the income of the small German peasants was largely derived from the sale of dairy products, poultry, and eggs to the urban industrial population. The elimination of this market would make it impossible for small farmers to specialize in the production for which they are best suited. They would have to produce more grain and potatoes, and could make a living thereby only if they had more, not less, land to cultivate. The greater the industrial hinterland, the less land the small peasant needs to make a living; and the smaller the industrial population, the more land he needs.

Mr. Morgenthau prefers Germans as peasants because as a class the German peasant took the Nazi virus later and in a somewhat milder form than the rest of the population. Actually, it was the other way about; the overwhelming majority of the in-

dustrial working class provided the most stubborn and consistent opposition to the Nazis, while most of the peasants did in fact vote for Hitler. This is demonstrated by the 1932-33 election results.

One might continue for pages to list Mr. Morgenthau's errors and miscalculations. But in the last analysis supporting data have little to do with his thesis. Its conception and application are determined by political factors. Indeed Mr. Morgenthau has altered his original plan so fast that he has had, apparently, no time to revise his statistical data. He has given up his original idea of flooding the Ruhr mines—a step that would have been one of the greatest of disasters for Europe. Instead, he now suggests that the entire German population of the Ruhr area be dumped into the interior of rump Germany. He makes this proposal without pausing to consider the economic and social effects of the deportation of another several million Germans from their traditional homelands.

Physically, it is possible to destroy the German industrial economy, to prevent or curb industrial reconstruction for peacetime purposes and thus to transform the heart of Europe into an industrially barren area. Similarly, it would have been possible to send several millions Jews to Kenya—to die there, for despite the testimony of Nazi experts, most of the deportees would have starved or otherwise perished. Mr. Morgenthau's deindustrialization plan, if carried out, would wipe out the economic basis for the existence of some twenty-five to thirty million Germans.

Certainly Mr. Morgenthau—

I repeat, Mr. President—Mr. Morgenthau has never spoken for the Members of the United States Senate. On December 15, 1945, 34 Senators, representing both the left and right wings of both parties, interceded with the President to prevent the starvation and extermination of the German and Austrian people which had been deliberately precipitated by the Morgenthau plan, and urged the President to take immediate steps to correct the evils that had already been committed.

I see upon this floor many Senators who were among the 34 persons who signed the petition.

On December 23 the National Planning Association added the full weight of its protest against the terrifying threat of famine, disease, and death which Mr. Morgenthau had succeeded in turning loose across the face of Europe.

On December 25, 1945, a large group of leading churchmen and laymen of all the American Christian churches, from Unitarian to Catholic, a group in which we find such outstanding names as William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, appealed to this Government in protest against the inhuman consequences for the children of Europe of Mr. Morgenthau's vengeance. These outstanding Americans joined in the conviction that:

Our future peace can only be built by those who are children today. Upon our merciful love toward them will depend their faith in the social, political, and religious principles we profess to serve.

Where, I ask, Mr. President, is there any expression in Mr. Morgenthau's words or acts of our native American love for children?

On February 10, 1946, the United States Department of Agriculture, in its 200-page summary of *The World Food Situation—1946*, warned of the prospect of reduced rations for the remainder of this year in Germany by stating that:

If rations must be reduced even from the present low levels, the situation in Germany, already characterized by a conspicuous rise in death rates, especially infant mortality, and in the incidence of epidemics, may abruptly take an alarming turn.

So, Mr. President, not night before last, but last February, was when we should have had that meeting in Constitution Hall. Not now, but more than a year ago, the Democratic majority, being warned by some of its own Senate and House Members who had been in Europe, should then have taken action instead of waiting until night before last to hold a meeting in Constitution Hall. They waited until after the administration had sent Mr. Hoover to Europe. During all the intervening time the Democratic Party not once called upon Mr. Hoover, the food expert. They allowed 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 to pass. They ignored every single report of every single committee which former President Roosevelt had sent to Europe. They ignored all conditions in Europe where there was chaos, want, suffering, and starvation. Finally, at long last, they sent former President Hoover to Europe. Night before last we heard him broadcast from abroad. Today, Mr. President, he is back in this country, having been called back by President Truman for the purpose of making a report. Why, in heaven's name, Mr. President, did they not heed the reports of the committees to which I have referred? Why did they not heed the statements of Herbert Lehman, who told them what was taking place in Europe? Why did they not trust the report of Carl Brandt, the adviser who was sent to our own military forces in Germany? Weeks and months have passed until today approximately 15,000,000 women and little children, as well as unborn babies, are suffering in Germany. Millions more are suffering in Austria, Rumania, and in other countries on this earth. Today they are in the same condition as were millions whose plights were ascertained by Woodrow Wilson, as shown in the book by Mr. Keynes. At that time even the President was afraid to carry his fight to the people because he believed that he might be called pro-German, or pro something else.

Mr. President, I am amazed to find that today the newspapers of this country are giving no publicity to some of the speeches which have been made upon this floor within the past few weeks.

A remarkable speech was made nearly 3 months ago by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. A similarly remarkable speech was made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. One of the greatest speeches ever delivered on this floor was delivered by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. But we looked in vain for a single word in the newspapers of America upon the subject. I ask you, Mr. President, why do the

newspapers fail to give publicity to such an important matter? All kinds of space was devoted recently to articles pertaining to the escape from a local prison jail of two of its inmates. Such an event was worthy of the whole front page of many newspapers. Yet, when the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Nebraska speak about 15,000,000 human beings who are starving today in Europe, and state that such conditions are due to the Morgenthau plan, almost without exception the newspapers remain silent. I ask again, Why?

On February 23, 1946, the World Council of Churches, including our American representatives, issued a terrible indictment of Mr. Morgenthau's plans, which had been incorporated in the Potsdam Declaration—an indictment which stated, in part, that—

Whereas . . . the transfers of populations have brought great hardship, distress, and suffering to millions of persons, including large numbers of women and children, and have resulted in disease and death for a large number of them . . . this situation is an offense to the Christian conscience and has aroused the concern which the Christian churches must feel for suffering humanity.

On March 7, 1946, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America made a report. I am particularly interested in the report of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ because my father-in-law, J. Cleveland Cady, was once its president. I know the fine splendid work that organization has done. What did they say on March 7, 6 weeks ago? This is what they said in their report:

A world of fear, hatred, cruelty, misery, and violent death is closing in on the prospect of a world of fellowship and love. . . . The churches of Christ cannot condone the punishment of whole peoples. No lasting peace can be built on revenge or be founded on oppression. The strong must adopt enlightened policies at some cost to themselves to achieve a united world.

On March 20, 1946, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger cabled to the New York Times that even Gen. Lucius T. Clay, head of American Occupation Forces in Germany, had become so frightened by the consequences of the Morgenthau plan at even this stage of development that he had dispatched Col. Hugh B. Hester to Washington in February to explain the tragic situation in Germany. Mr. Sulzberger went on to say that—

General Clay has been let down by Washington. . . . United States military government officials are working to get a better deal from Washington. They argue that starvation may threaten under the present program, that even the planned level of recovery will be set back, that "If the United States wants to turn Europe to the left this is the best way," and it is unfair to let General Clay down in his promise to maintain the ration and make America appear not to keep its word.

Mr. President, I am sure Mr. Morgenthau must have learned of the statement made by Gen. George Patton in one of his last conversations with a very close friend. General Patton remarked,

concerning the consequences of the Morgenthau plan:

We fought the War of 1776 for independence. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves. We fought the war of 1918 to make the world safe for democracy. We fought this war to lose everything we had gained from the other three.

Mr. President, that was George Patton. God bless his memory.

Yet, Mr. President, as recently as March 19, 1946, Mr. Morgenthau, this self-styled spokesman for the American people, had the unmitigated nerve to continue his infamous crusade by again pleading for an even more ruthless application of the inhuman policies which have already brought such unmeasurable suffering to Europe.

Mr. Morgenthau lamented that:

The whole program to make Germany incapable of future aggression is being applied hesitantly and half-heartedly.

According to the Washington Star, Mr. Morgenthau continued to demand that:

The United States, Great Britain, and Russia carry out the spirit and the letter of the Potsdam Declaration specifying the denazification and deindustrialization of Germany, which he advocated as a Cabinet member.

Mr. President, the above record clearly and convincingly demonstrates that what Mr. Morgenthau has managed to do in the name of the American people, behind their backs and without their knowledge or consent, has become an international disgrace, an international calamity. From every corner of this land, from every walk of life, the American people continue to voice their angry protests against everything for which Mr. Morgenthau stands. Mr. Morgenthau does not speak in the name of the American people. He has deliberately betrayed their principles and their trust.

Mr. President, Chester Davis, Mr. LaGuardia, Secretary Anderson, Governor Lehman, former President Hoover, Gen. Lucius T. Clay, the President's Famine Relief Committee, and the President himself have exposed to the whole world the tragic hunger catastrophe now threatening civilization.

The record I have quoted proves beyond all question of a doubt the direct relationship between this abominable Morgenthau plan and the desperate food calamity we confront.

Yet, in spite of these facts, in a speech in Chicago on April 6, President Truman assured the American people that he was not pessimistic about the future. But throughout his entire speech President Truman did not once mention the crucial problem which the world must solve if there is to be any hope of peace in the future, namely, the problem of Germany.

It is simply astounding, Mr. President, to find the most ardent champions of the United Nations, including the President himself, continuing in their refusal to face the ugly facts of our international life as they now stand revealed in the ghastly and inhuman consequences of the Morgenthau plan for Germany after almost a year of operation.

Why is it, Mr. President, that those men who have been shouting loudest

about their devotion to internationalism will not raise a single word of protest against the running cancer which Mr. Morgenthau has spread over the heart of Europe? Why is it that these men will neither look upon the festering sore that has been created nor raise a finger to heal it?

Why is it that instead, Mr. President, when an even more terrible catastrophe threatens humanity as a result of those men whose deliberate malice or criminal incompetence have already brought a world calamity upon us, those men who have clamored most persistently for international cooperation, maintain a conspiracy of silence?

I will state why, Mr. President, when I read a chapter in the book I have in my hand. I will state why when I read a chapter written by Andrew Carnegie himself. When Senators hear that, they will no longer wonder at the criminal conspiracy of silence I have mentioned.

President Truman assured the American people of his complete confidence that:

There is no international problem which cannot be solved if there are the will and the strength to solve it through the United Nations which we have created.

But, Mr. President, the problem of Germany has been explicitly removed from the jurisdiction of the United Nations, the Charter of which specifically provides that that organization is not to have a single word to say concerning the ultimate fate of those nations which have been the enemies of the major powers in this war.

According to article 107 of the United Nations Charter:

Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war, by the governments having responsibility for such action.

The problem of Germany, Mr. President, is not a problem which the Big Three would permit to be placed in the hands of anyone else. The ultimate fate of Germany lies squarely in the hands of the President and he cannot so easily dispose of it as he suggested by throwing it into the lap of the United Nations. Mr. President, I venture the prophecy that when Mr. Truman goes before the electorate in 1948 such an answer will not satisfy those Americans who have relatives in Germany, sisters and brothers over there who starved. When the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] filed a petition of 800 citizens of Michigan, when I filed petitions of thousands of citizens of the State of North Dakota, when the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, accompanied by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and others went to the President and begged him, months ago, that the American people be allowed to make food shipments to Germany and Austria what was the answer? The President said, "No; it is in the hands of the Department of State."

I say Mr. President, that when Mr. Truman goes upon the rostrum in the



next campaign, or when some of the Democratic Senators who ought to know better and who have not lifted their fingers on behalf of thousands and hundreds of thousands of their constituents, go upon the rostrum, it is not going to be an answer in that campaign to quote Mr. Truman when he says "I have nothing to do with it. It is all in the hands of the State Department." The American people are not going to be satisfied with that kind of explanation. The day is coming, and it is coming fast, when those who have been backing up Mr. Morgenthau, when those in authority who have been sitting idly by while Mr. Morgenthau has been carrying his plan through, will find retribution at hand, and when all over this great country of ours men will repeat the words of Franklin Roosevelt who said he was not fighting the German people, that he was fighting only Hitler and his cohorts; who said "There will be no starvation of women and little children in any country, whether they be our allies or whether they be our enemies."

Mr. President, I say that the Members of the Senate who sit on the other side of the aisle, together with the Democratic leadership in America, have fallen down on the job. They have not carried out the principles for which Franklin Roosevelt stood when he said, "There shall be no starvation or suffering in any of these foreign lands." I say the responsibility is upon their shoulders and upon their shoulders alone.

I say further, Mr. President, that not a Democratic Senator, aside from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has, so far as I know, ever raised his voice in behalf of the millions of people who this very minute are dying over there like flies because of this despicable Morgenthau policy foisted upon them, in spite of everything that our Army experts have said, in spite of everything that the leading men of our country, including former President Hoover, have said.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. McKELLAR for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 342. The proceedings incident to the joint resolution appear at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's remarks for the day.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, throughout his speech, President Truman evaded, ignored, and misrepresented this problem of Germany to the American people, in spite of the fact that the peace of the world which now centers in the heart of Berlin is a problem for the solution of which the President has a primary responsibility.

Mr. President, time and again I have stood on this Senate floor and on public platforms throughout America and stated that I would go as far as anyone in assuring the trial, conviction, and punishment of the vicious Axis war criminals.

But the war has been over for almost a year now, and we cannot permit hatred and vengeance to continue to blind us to the fact that now our primary responsibility to humanity is to win the peace. If we are ever to know peace again in our lifetimes, we must now make an historic decision. If the President's confidence in

the future is ever to be sustained, he must choose now between peace and the Morgenthau plan. He cannot have both.

On the basis of his own statements, President Truman has now admitted that in spite of the fact that the group of bloody bitter-enders which is doing Mr. Morgenthau's dirty work do not want to scrap his plan, the momentum of events, the sheer weight of logic, and the full-throated protests of the American people will compel this administration to repudiate once and for all these inhuman directives for the enslavement and liquidation of the German-speaking peoples.

Mr. President, even the President of the United States cannot long continue to talk in terms of the violent contradictions which filled his latest speech, without being found out. Unless the following solemn statements of principle, which the President insisted must underlie our help in building the peace, apply to the whole world and all nations, they are meaningless, hypocritical verbiage.

In speaking of the awful conditions in Europe, President Truman stated that:

We find her suffering the terrible pangs of hunger and privation. Economic reconstruction is, first of all, a task for the peoples and the governments of Europe.

But President Truman did not once mention the fact that his support of the Morgenthau plan for Germany had resulted in the worst hunger catastrophe in Europe known to civilized nations. He did not mention the fact that because we have failed to provide even the minimum rations promised to the German civilian administrators last September by General Clay, acting for this administration, we are confronted with the necessity of scaling down the ration diet to 800 calories a day, which is what the Nazi criminals fed their victims in Belzen and Dachau concentration camps. The President, of course, did not mention the fact that such treatment robbed the German people of even the physical strength necessary to economic reconstruction.

Mr. President, when the majority leader and other Senators went to Europe they viewed some of the concentration camps established in Germany. We now find the same things happening, according to the experts of the American Army of Occupation in Germany and according to the experts sent over there by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, we find concentration camps in Germany today.

President Truman went on to state, concerning the terrible conditions in Europe and throughout the world, that:

We shall help because we know that we ourselves cannot enjoy prosperity in a world of economic stagnation. . . . We shall help because economic distress anywhere in the world is a fertile breeding ground for violent political upheaval.

Yet President Truman did not once refer to the fact that on March 26 the Allied Control Council announced its 1949 plans for the maximum level of the German economy in a report which admitted Germany would be forced back down below the level of the poverty, unemployment,

political chaos and hunger of the black depression of 1932, the year which spawned Hitler. The President did not mention the fact that according to these plans, Germany was not even going to be permitted to survive as an agricultural community, since the standard of living of agricultural production, and of industrial rehabilitation permitted, will still necessitate an annual import of food to the value of \$600,000,000 and will force the elimination of 20 to 30 million Germans, and will thus destroy the economic and social foundations of Christian Europe.

President Truman asserted in the same speech that:

We shall help because we feel it is simple humanitarianism to lend a hand to our friends and allies who are convalescing from wounds inflicted by our common enemy.

Yet President Truman did not tell the American people that this outlandish expression of his simple humanitarianism merely conceals the fact that at this very moment he is continuing into the definite future Mr. Morgenthau's vicious distinction between friend and foe, among millions of women and children, among the innocent and guilty alike, and dragging this extension of the war into peacetime down to the level of 2-year-olds, all in the face of the gravest hunger catastrophe ever to threaten the civilized world.

What kind of humanitarianism is this, Mr. President? Evidently President Truman has long since forgotten that once America had a President by the name of Abraham Lincoln, who said something about "malice toward none, and charity for all."

At this very moment, after nearly a year of "peace," the President has finally permitted the reopening of mail to Germany. Letters of not over 1 ounce and post cards may be sent; but no money, no drafts, checks or money orders, even for specific humanitarian purposes are permitted. Even notes of 1 ounce and post cards remain censored.

What kind of humanitarianism is this, Mr. President, when even this gesture was permitted only after the State and War Departments threatened to expose the Treasury Department for its continued refusal to permit any communication with Germany?

What kind of humanitarianism is it which permits the Treasury Department to get away with its continued refusal to permit the sending of relief packages through the mail, not because there is the slightest legitimate excuse for such refusal but merely because Mr. Morgenthau's strong-arm men in the Treasury Department are determined to continue to the bitter end their plan to liquidate the German people. I ask, Mr. President, why, nearly a year after the war has ended, a Senator or Representative, if he has a brother over in Germany, should not be allowed to send him a package of food. The Treasury Department at this very moment refuses to permit millions of Americans to send relief directly to the German-speaking peoples of Europe by claiming that the sending of food, clothing, and medicine to freezing, disease-ridden, and starving

people would constitute a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

President Truman stated, as the final principle which must underlie and motivate our help in building the peace of the future, that:

We want no return to the kind of narrow economic nationalism which poisoned international relations and undermined living standards between the two World Wars.

Yet again, Mr. President, there was no mention by President Truman of the glaring fact that the very division of Germany into four spheres, the liquidation of her national resources, and tremendous industrial capacity and skill, upon which the whole of Europe continues to be so desperately dependent for reconstruction, is turning Europe into a madhouse. There is no mention of the fact that the Morgenthau Plan has created four political and economic weapons out of Germany which the four victor powers are now wielding against each other in the most insane resurgence of economic and political nationalisms known to modern times. I challenge anyone to demonstrate that by continuing to pursue the statistical lunacies and the economic and political monstrosities contained in Mr. Morgenthau's Plan for Germany, this Administration is not now betraying the confidence and trust of the American people.

(At this point a message from the House was received, and Mr. Langer yielded to Mr. BARKLEY, whereupon certain legislative and executive business was transacted, all of which appear at the conclusion of Mr. Langer's remarks for the day.)

Mr. Langer. Mr. President, a few moments ago I mentioned the name of Andrew Carnegie. I stated that I would read the last chapter of a book which he wrote. The title is "Triumphant Democracy." Mr. President, I charge that the pending joint resolution to give—because that is exactly what it is, although it is called a loan—approximately \$4,000,000,000 to England is a part of a scheme which was conceived years and years ago by Andrew Carnegie himself. I hold in my hand a copy of his autobiography, and I wish to read the last chapter of it. I may add that, as most Senators know, no doubt, subsequently this chapter was eliminated, and it is not to be found in later editions of his book *Triumphant Democracy*. The book was published by Charles Scribner's Sons. It was copyrighted in 1886, 1888, and 1893, so presumably it was published in approximately those years.

After telling all about this country—the manufacturers, the mining, the railways, the American people, the cities, the towns, the music, and the education here—and after telling what a great country the United States is, Mr. Carnegie closed with the chapter which I am about to read, and which I believe should be read by every American. Andrew Carnegie came to the United States and built himself a fortune. It is my understanding that he never even became a citizen of the United States. He took that money back with him to Scotland, back to Skibo Castle. He invited

the King of England there, and over the castle flew the American flag and the English flag. As the King was about to leave, Andrew Carnegie said to him, in substance, "I am dedicating myself to the proposition of seeing that our countries are reunited, and we are going to have one nation."

In the last chapter of his book he tells how England and the United States are going to be one country again. When I conclude reading this chapter, I shall read from a newspaper published in San Francisco in 1912, which will show something of what was being contemplated even then. Then let those who wish to vote for the pending joint resolution vote for it if they choose to. It cannot be said that they will not vote with their eyes open, Mr. President. Of one thing I am certain, and that is that when the American people thoroughly understand what Carnegie and others like him attempted and are now attempting to put over on the American people, there will be no question as to the outcome of any election which occurs in the United States at any time in the near future.

At the beginning of the last chapter of his autobiography, Mr. Carnegie quotes a sentence from David Hartley, a member of the British House of Commons, the British Parliament. The quotation is dated May 15, 1777:

I venture to prophesy that the principles of a federal alliance are the only terms of peace that ever will and ever ought to obtain between the two countries.

Mr. Carnegie then said:

I think one is excusable who has been compelled to live for months upon figures and hard facts, and record only the past, if, his task accomplished, he indulges in a look ahead, where not what is, but what is to be, is considered, and where, being no longer bound by results achieved, he is fancy free. I have taken this privilege freely for myself in this closing chapter, and, Utopian as the dream may seem, I place on record my belief that it is one day to become a reality.

That is what that multimillionaire of the steel industry said—that some day it will be a reality. He further said:

Until a little more than a hundred years ago, the English-speaking race dwelt together in unity, the American being as much a citizen of Britain as the Englishman, Scotsman, Welshman, or Irishman. A difference unhappily arose under the British Constitution—their common heritage—as to the right of the citizens of the older part of the States to tax their fellows in the newer part across the sea without their consent; but separation was not contemplated by Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Jay, and other leaders. On the contrary, these great men never ceased to proclaim their loyalty to, and their desire to remain a part of, Britain, and they disclaimed any idea of separation, which was indeed accepted at last, but only when forced upon them as a sad necessity, from which there was no honorable escape if they were to maintain the rights they had acquired, not as American but as British citizens.

On the other hand, the motherland, which forced the issue upon her loyal citizens in America, sees nothing more clearly today than that she was in error, and that she converted a constitutional agitation for redress of grievances into a question of patriotic resistance to the exercise of unconstitutional power, an issue which Britons

have never been slow to accept, and have never failed successfully to meet. There is no British statesman who does not feel that if the Britons in America had not resisted taxation imposed without their consent, and fought out the issue to the end, they would have been false to the blood in their veins.

Mr. President, later in the chapter from which I have been reading, Mr. Carnegie quotes some of the men he has mentioned. He quotes Horace Walpole, as follows:

You will not be surprised that I am what I always was, a zealot for liberty in every part of the globe, and consequently that I most heartily wish success to the Americans. They have hitherto not made one blunder, and the administration has made a thousand, besides the two capital ones of first provoking and then of uniting the colonies. The latter seem to have as good heads and hearts as we want both.

Mr. President, I have read from a letter to Horace Mann, dated September 7, 1775, as set forth at page 152 of a book entitled "Horace Walpole and His World," published by Scribner's.

Andrew Carnegie said further:

Isaac Barré, member of Parliament, 1761 to 1790, said, in reply to Lord North's declaration that he would never think of repealing the tea duty until he saw America prostrate at his feet.

That was Isaac Barré's idea of the kind of treatment which should be accorded to this country. He said:

To effect this is not so easy as some imagine; the Americans are a numerous, a respectable, a hardy, a free people. But were it ever so easy, does any friend to his country really wish to see America thus humbled?

Those are some of the reasons which Mr. Carnegie cites for abolishing the Stars and Stripes and substituting one flag for the United States and Great Britain. By the way, I have one of those flags. It is in my office.

Andrew Carnegie said further:

Britain and America now being fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax the colonists without their consent were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens, and therefore only did their duty, the question arises, Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties—

Referring to England—

and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

I cannot think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a reunion of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship.

First. In race—and there is a great deal in race—the American remains three-fourths purely British. The mixture of the German, which constitutes substantially all of the remainder, though not strictly British, is yet Germanic. The Briton of today is himself composed in large measure of the Germanic element, and Germans, Briton, and American are all of the Teutonic race.

If that statement be true, Mr. President, all the Englishmen in England are Germans, and all the Britons in this country are Germans. In that event, why the Morgenthau plan? Why starve 15,000,000 German men and women and children.



Andrew Carnegie has said that the Britons and Americans are really Germans. I continue reading:

The amount of blood other than Anglo-Saxon and Germanic which has entered into the American is almost too trifling to deserve notice, and has been absorbed without changing him in any fundamental trait. The American remains British, differing less from the Briton than the Irishman, Scotsman, Welshman, and Englishman differ from each other. Englishmen, Scotsmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen are all Britons, and the American (a term which of course includes the Canadian) entering among these would be as near the common type resulting from a union of the five as any of the other parts. Indeed, the American in many respects resembles the Scotsman more than the Englishman does, and he also in other respects resembles the Englishman more than he does the Scot.

He resembles both Englishman and Scot much more than the Irishman resembles either. His introduction into a common British-American citizenship would not produce a resultant different greatly from that of the present union of Scot, Welshman, Irishman, and Englishman. The action of a Congress elected by all these elements would not differ much upon fundamental questions affecting the rights, liberties, and privileges of the people, from a Congress of Americans sitting in Washington, or of Canadians in Ottawa, or from the action of a British Parliament, similarly elected, sitting in London. No citizen of any of the present states, either British or American, would have reason to fear the loss of anything which he now holds dear. He could rest securely in the belief that his fellows of the other states could be trusted so to act that the united mass would not oscillate.

A feeling of confidence in each other among the respective communities of the race in Great Britain and America may be expected to grow, as political institutions continue to assimilate.

It is to be noted that only in the region of political ideas is there dissimilarity, for no rupture whatever between the parts has ever taken place in language, literature, religion, or law. In these, uniformity has always existed; although separated politically, the unity of the parts has never been disturbed in these strong cohesive and cementing links. The books and periodicals, read upon both sides of the Atlantic, are rapidly becoming the same. The decision of one court is good law in all. Language remains uniform, every approved change in one part of the great realm being rapidly adopted throughout the English-speaking world. Religious ideas are the common property of the race. There seems nothing, therefore, to keep the sections of the race apart, but everything to reunite them.

Second. No one questions that if, instead of 1,800 miles of water between America and Britain, there lay another Mississippi Valley, the English-speaking race would be one politically, since the federal system of government has proved that immense areas can be successfully governed under one head, and can exist as one power, the freest government of the parts producing the strongest government of the whole. The difference of land and water lying between the people has hitherto been great, and, in the words of the poet, instead of mountains, we can say that—

"Oceans interposed

Make enemies of nations, who had else,  
Like kindred drops, been mingled into one."

That is quite true of the past; but oceans no longer constitute barriers between nations. These already furnished the cheapest of all modes of communication between men.

Mr. Carnegie says:

It has been my good fortune recently to travel from the Pacific Coast to Britain. The journey from San Francisco to New York was made in a moving hotel, in which our party had travelled for 6 weeks with every want supplied. The time necessary for the trip is 5 days. The other half of the journey, after a short rest at the halfway house, New York, was performed in one of the best ocean greyhounds, the time consumed from land to land being only a few hours more than that required for the journey from San Francisco to New York. Over land and over sea we had travelled under the best conditions of today. No luxury was wanting. The moving hotel over the land was the best of its kind, as was also the moving hotel over the water. The ocean voyage was in every respect more comfortable and by far less fatiguing than the overland journey.

The future is, probably, to render travel by sea, if not quite as fast, yet more comfortable to people in general than land travel can possibly be made.

He says further:

The delegate to a conference at Washington, leaving Liverpool or Southampton, now reaches that city in just about the same time as the delegate from San Francisco, Seattle, or Victoria on the Pacific Coast.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded the floor for the day.)

#### ABOLITION OF THE POLL TAX

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. For what purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator will yield long enough for the Senate to pass, by unanimous consent, House bill 7.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, indeed; I yield with pleasure. What is the bill about?

Mr. MORSE. It is the anti-poll-tax measure.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that we are in position to save the Senate a great deal of time, inasmuch as the Senator and I are about the only Members of the Senate now present on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let the Senator from Oregon make his request.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7, an act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax the prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield to the Senator from Arizona for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota refused to yield to the Senator from Arizona, but he did yield to the Senator from Oregon for a unanimous consent request. The Senator from Oregon makes a unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 7. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. I object for the reason, Mr. President, that Senators in-

terested in House bill No. 7 are entitled to be present and to vote, and the Senator from North Dakota objects to a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

#### THE OPA—TELEGRAM FROM H. A. BENNING

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LANGER. For what purpose?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have a short statement I should like to make, and a telegram which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD. I will not even take the time to read the telegram.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. President, I have here a telegram which typifies the problems which the Office of Price Administration itself is creating for the friends of OPA in Congress. I should like to read it to the Senate. It is from H. A. Benning, of Ogden, Utah, the president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., which operates sugar factories in many parts of Utah and Idaho and other States. Mr. Benning says:

OGDEN, UTAH., April 17, 1946.

CHARLES C. GOSSETT,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We cannot procure cotton-filter cloth without which we cannot process the 1946 crop of sugar beets which is now growing. Manufacturers of this commodity state that because of OPA price regulations they cannot manufacture this type of fabric and in many cases the looms used to manufacture it have been dismantled and replaced by looms which produce a product that is not subject to OPA price control. We cannot use that product in our factories. This situation is critical and demands prompt and effective action. Apparently relief can only be obtained through Congress as all efforts to work out this situation with OPA have been unsuccessful as usual. The same situation exists in cotton bags and even with huge surpluses of cotton we are forced to use paper bags which are very unsatisfactory. If OPA is necessary cannot Congress force efficient and sound administration?

THE AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO.  
H. A. BENNING, President.

Mr. President, the administrators of OPA must iron out such problems as these. I feel OPA is necessary to prevent a disastrous boom and bust, a depression which will ruin our American standard of living. But as a friend of OPA, I fear for its life unless the administrators of OPA take action to end such conditions as these. This is perfect ammunition for the foes of OPA who would scrap it entirely. I ask Mr. Porter to take action in this case and others like it. We in Congress who want to continue OPA must have his help if we are to win the fight for continued price control.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LANGER. For what purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for the consideration of a message which has just come from the House?

Mr. LANGER. How much time will it take?

Mr. McCARRAN. Practically none at all. It is merely for the purpose of having conferees appointed.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the matter referred to by the Senator from Nevada?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5504) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE BILL 2

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will pardon me, but in order that we may know how we may proceed this afternoon with reference to a conference report, is the Senator in position to indicate to us how long he expects to continue?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know how long I shall speak, but I shall not be through this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator think he might yield for the consideration of a conference report?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me be frank with the Senator. I do not want to mislead him. There will be some discussion of the report, and it is estimated by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] that it may require an hour's time. I want to be fair with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. It will be necessary to have a roll call to establish the presence of a quorum, for that purpose, will it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for the purpose indicated, Mr. President, if I can obtain

unanimous consent that I may resume the floor when debate on the conference report is concluded and the report acted upon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it be agreeable to the Senator from North Dakota if we could tentatively plan to take up the conference report at, let us say, 3:30 this afternoon? While consideration of it may take as much as an hour, I expect that half an hour or three-quarters of an hour will be sufficient. The Senator from Nevada will explain the conference report, and I will explain the other position. I do not think it will take more than three-quarters of an hour at the most.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose provided I obtain unanimous consent that when the debate on the report is concluded and the report is acted upon I again shall have the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I make that request.

Mr. LANGER. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from North Dakota that if he yields to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of submitting a conference report he will not thereafter lose the floor at the conclusion of the discussion of the conference report? The Chair hears no objection, and the request is granted.

Mr. LANGER. This is done with the understanding that the report will be submitted at about 3:30.

Mr. McCARRAN. Along about 3:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the request is amended to include consideration of the conference report shall be begun at 3:30 this afternoon. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota again yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is in the Chamber. I will say that a little while ago we entered into a unanimous-consent agreement that at about 3:30 today the Senator from North Dakota would yield so that we might take up the conference report on S. 2, known as the airport bill. The majority leader is compelled to leave here at about 4 o'clock today. Other Senators are absent. We find in checking over the roll call that quite a number of Senators are absent. I therefore wish to state to those who may be present that I shall not bring up the conference report today, but shall attempt, after I have made an investigation to determine who may be present or may be absent, to bring up the conference report tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada,

who has been absent during the period this matter has been here. I thought that we had a rather mutual understanding that we would try to accommodate ourselves to each other in respect to this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Tomorrow afternoon it is not going to be practicable for me to have the matter taken up, as I must leave at a quarter to 3. I do not anticipate we can conclude consideration of the matter tomorrow unless we begin at noon.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator that it would be entirely agreeable to begin at once upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow at noon. According to the information I have received from Senators who are interested in the matter, we ought to conclude it before the Senator from Maine is obliged to leave tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe it can be concluded within an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to be sure that that arrangement is satisfactory to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. It is satisfactory to me, Mr. President, if it is understood that I may obtain the floor at the conclusion of the debate and action on the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from North Dakota has stated that he will not have concluded his speech before tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. I am fearful that I will not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I share in that fear, I will say, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. The fear is well founded. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a matter of record, I will say, that the Senator will not conclude today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that the Senator from North Dakota modify his unanimous-consent request with respect to bringing up the conference report on S. 2, to the time now agreed upon by the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LANGER. I do so modify the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the conference report on S. 2, and further requests that if he yields for that purpose he will not thereafter lose the floor at the completion of the consideration of the conference report.

Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### APPROPRIATIONS TO PAY INCREASED COMPENSATION TO FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.



Mr. McKELLAR. From the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to report without amendment, House Joint Resolution 342, a joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 to pay increased compensation authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say that the Committee on Appropriations has been polled, and 17 of its members, all who are in town except one, and he has scruples about the polling of a committee, have voted in favor of reporting the joint resolution.

With the consent of the Senator from North Dakota, I desire to make an explanation of the measure. Increased compensation has been authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies. The joint resolution simply carries it into effect. There is nothing else in this particular joint resolution except provision for the increases in pay which the Congress has already approved.

These items have been lifted from the Second Deficiency Bill for 1946 now before the Committee and incorporated in this joint resolution.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 to pay increased compensation authorized by law to officers and employees of sundry Federal and other agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from North Dakota very much for yielding to me for this purpose.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1757) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to broaden the scope and raise the rank of veterans' priority, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 145) providing for an adjournment of the House from April 18, 1946, to April 30, 1946, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5856) to provide

for trade relations between the United States and the Philippines, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### EASTER ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield? Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The House has just sent over a concurrent resolution providing for a 10-day recess of the House. I ask that it be laid before the Senate for present consideration.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 145), which was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 18, 1946, it stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday, April 30, 1946.*

#### VETERANS' EMERGENCY HOUSING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to express regret that the concurrent resolution for an adjournment of the House of Representatives comes at a time when the conferees are in session on the veterans' emergency housing legislation. I had hoped that we might conclude the work of the conferees and have the conference report agreed to before the House took its recess. Whether the conferees can come to any conclusion today I do not know; and even if they should, unanimous consent or a special rule requiring a two-thirds vote in the House would be required in order to have the conference report considered today.

Under the circumstances it appears that if we cannot conclude our deliberations and have a conference report ready to be considered today in the House, it will have to go over until after the reconvening of the House. I am still hopeful that we may be able to have a report ready today, because time is running against this program, and it is of the essence. If we can arrive at a conclusion, so that the authorities may reasonably know what to expect in the way of a conference report, and may go ahead with their plans, it may be that no great amount of time will be lost; but I regret that we have been unable to conclude our deliberations and have a conference report ready for action by the two Houses before the House takes its recess.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

#### CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER) will yield to me for a moment, I may say that I am compelled to absent myself from the Chamber in a few moments. I ask the Senator to yield to me so that I may ask unanimous consent for the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nominations on the Executive Calendar. They consist of postmaster nominations and one nomination each in the Army and the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Donald Campbell to be brigadier general for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold M. Bemis to be rear admiral, for temporary appointment, in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to voice objection because of the fact that tomorrow is Good Friday. I do not wish to make any point about it, but I do not believe that the Senate ought to be in session on Good Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that we have never followed the custom of adjourning for that reason. I appreciate the Senator's devotion to that day. However, I understand that he does not object to the request, but merely wishes to voice his own position.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
FOUNDING OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for himself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, to authorize suitable participation by the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Princeton University. Similar resolutions have been adopted on behalf of other universities in the United States.

From the Committee on the Library I report the joint resolution favorably, without amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution is drawn in similar form to resolutions which have been adopted with regard to other universities, including Harvard, Yale, and several others.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that in practice and in form the joint resolution is in harmony with past action by the Senate and the House?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize suitable participation by the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Princeton University was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Government and the people of the United States unite with Princeton University in a fitting and appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of its founding.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Princeton University Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "commission") to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States and 4 persons to be appointed by him, the President of the Senate and 4 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 4 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with the representatives of Princeton University, the State of New Jersey, and the borough of Princeton, N. J., in the appropriate observance of such anniversary, and shall extend appropriate courtesies to the delegates of foreign universities and other foreign learned bodies, or individuals, attending the celebrations as guests of Princeton University. The Commission is authorized in performing its functions under this section to utilize the services and facilities of the various agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, with the consent of such agencies and instrumentalities.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation. They shall select a chairman and a secretary from among their number, but the President of the United States shall be designated as the honorary chairman of the Commission.

The preamble was agreed to.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for 4 or 5 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

## RECESS

After the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the order of the Senate previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, to Friday, April 19, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, now a foreign-service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

Kenneth C. Krentz, of Iowa, now a foreign-service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Charles A. Bay, of Minnesota, now a foreign-service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

H. Merrell Benninghoff, of New York, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons to be foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry C. Barkhorn, Jr., of New Jersey.

Herbert S. Bennett, of New York.

Robert H. Lunt, of Pennsylvania.

Elle Jan Nadelman, of New York.

Miss Helen R. Nicholl, of New York.

Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.

Claiborne Pell, of New York.

CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF  
HAWAII

Hon. Samuel B. Kemp, of Hawaii, to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii. (Justice Kemp is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 3, 1945.)

## POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

## ARIZONA

Hazel M. Peebles, Sacaton, Ariz., in place of Lenore Hoopes, resigned.

## CALIFORNIA

Charles V. Shaffer, Del Paso Heights, Calif., in place of A. M. Falck, retired.

Lawrence N. Fowler, Kelseyville, Calif., in place of E. L. Fowler, resigned.

William I. Stewart, Kernville, Calif., in place of C. E. Timmons, deceased.

## ILLINOIS

J. Wiley Lucas, Abingdon, Ill., in place of A. L. Knable, deceased.

William P. Hall, Elizabethtown, Ill., in place of G. A. Wall, deceased.

Fred R. Drews, Sidney, Ill., in place of W. J. Woodard, resigned.

## IOWA

Raymond W. Thomas, Green Mountain, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

## KANSAS

Georgie L. Hunt, Rolla, Kans., in place of M. G. Goddard, resigned.

## KENTUCKY

Edna P. Leger, Baxter, Ky., in place of V. N. Minton, resigned.

John S. Mahan, Princeton, Ky., in place of P. J. Blackburn, resigned.

## LOUISIANA

Claire C. Mahaffey, Jennings, La., in place of L. J. Nohe, deceased.

Volene B. Bray, Jones, La., in place of B. F. Morris, resigned.

Robert W. Collier, Sr., Oakdale, La., in place of J. A. Williams, deceased.

## MAINE

Nelida Arsenault, Mexico, Maine, in place of Alfred Bolvin, resigned.

## MARYLAND

Thomas H. Collier, Grasonville, Md., in place of R. E. Ireland, transferred.

## MINNESOTA

Percy B. Boyer, Beltrami, Minn., in place of E. E. Boyer, resigned.

## MISSISSIPPI

Ida L. Cain, Prairie, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## MISSOURI

Henry E. Roper, Bernie, Mo., in place of H. E. Roper. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NEBRASKA

Meredith Y. Cloud, Elk Creek, Nebr., in place of B. F. Karas, deceased.

## NEW JERSEY

John P. Larkin, Spotswood, N. J., in place of M. G. Appleby, resigned.

## NEW YORK

Helen Regan, Carle Place, N. Y., in place of Francis McDonald, declined appointment.

Kenneth L. Dubuque, Peru, N. Y., in place of B. E. Holden, retired.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Thelma D. Warren, Newton Grove, N. C., in place of B. C. Cox, resigned.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Walter F. Sheldon, Napoleon, N. Dak., in place of Peter Meier, transferred.

## OKLAHOMA

Alma C. Binns, Kellyville, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## OREGON

Hugh T. Smith, Forest Grove, Oreg., in place of Edwin Allen, retired.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Anthony P. Pellino, Lewis Run, Pa., in place of A. D. Pietranton, deceased.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Pearl J. Sauls, Cades, S. C., in place of C. S. McGill, resigned.

## TEXAS

J. Dea Allen, Blum, Tex., in place of G. A. Adair, transferred.

Meta Cargile, Converse, Tex., in place of H. H. Gold, retired.



Leland C. Adams, Holliday, Tex., in place of Mabel Darden, resigned.

Marjorie L. Burton, Katy, Tex., in place of Vernon May, removed.

Margaret M. Harden, Larue, Tex., in place of Sissie Curtis, transferred.

Betty F. Irby, Texon, Tex., in place of W. M. Irby, resigned.

Oneta M. Hazel, Wink, Tex., in place of P. E. Jette, retired.

#### UTAH

Edwin F. Marchetti, Helper, Utah, in place of E. C. Gibson, transferred.

#### WASHINGTON

William Norris, Amboy, Wash., in place of Cora Ray, resigned.

Carol E. Sherman, Dryden, Wash., in place of C. L. Sherman, resigned.

#### WISCONSIN

Charles W. Lee, High Bridge, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

#### WYOMING

Owen W. Cranney, Afton, Wyo., in place of A. H. Linford, retired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

#### IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be a brigadier general*

Thomas Donald Campbell

#### IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

*To be a rear admiral*

Harold M. Bemis

#### POSTMASTERS

#### IOWA

Theodore H. Seyb, Donnellson.  
Morten E. Petersen, Turin.

#### KANSAS

Raymond J. Gegen, Colwich.  
Emma V. Hedge, Hoxie.  
Harold R. Winter, Scott City.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Mildred H. Hall, Acton.  
John C. Kelleher, Holden.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Blanche C. Wilson, Monticello.  
Alex Polk, Oak Vale.

#### MISSOURI

Hazel Munkirs, Kearney.

#### MONTANA

Otto Wyatt, Terry.  
Charles A. Watkins, Townsend.  
Lucile R. Cloud, Wolf Point.

#### TEXAS

John E. McDuffey, Seymour.

#### VERMONT

Elmore H. Chase, St. Johnsbury Center.

#### VIRGINIA

Atlee B. Crowder, Clarksville.

#### WASHINGTON

Harriett B. Konopaski, Beaver.  
Evelyn E. Ackerman, Sekiu.  
Warren Lincoln, Shelton.  
Grace W. Schroeder, Zillah.

#### WYOMING

Mabel E. Nolan, Mills.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou unseen Presence, we would pause in this solemn moment to meditate upon the beautiful fellowship of our Lord as set forth in the symbol of the vine and the branches. We are grateful for this rich brotherhood of kindred life, for that strange mysterious power which makes union with Thee an invincible force destined to conquer the world. As we break the mystic bread of sacrifice, and receive the blessings of our Lord, mercifully grant that we, walking in the way of the Cross, may find it none other than the way of life and peace.

O God, clear the depths of our hearts of strife and falsehood and let the sense of Thy forgiveness steal upon us, that we may be worthy to share Thy redemptive work. Clothe us with courage to befriend, with sincerity to shield, and with charity to be merciful to all. Keep alive in our breasts the One who said "This do in remembrance of Me"; who faced failure, saved humanity, unsealed earth's tombs, and brought to man new hope and fresh inspiration. In the name of our glorified Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

APRIL 15, 1946.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052-a), I have designated Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, Hon. R. EWING THOMASON, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, Hon. DEWEY SHORT, and Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy.

Very truly yours,

ANDREW J. MAY,

*Chairman.*

#### JOINT ANTI-FASCIST REFUGEE COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks the Clerk to read the following announcement.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, he did, on April 17, 1946, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful and deliberate refusal of Miss Helen R. Bryan, Dr. Jacob Auslander, Prof. Lyman R. Bradley, Mrs. Marjorie Chodorov, Mr. Howard Fast, Mrs. Ernestina G. Fleischman, Leverett Gleason, Harry M. Justiz, Mrs. Samuel Kamsley, Mrs. Ruth Lelder, James Lustig, Manuel Magana, Dr. Louis Miller, Herman Shumlin, Mrs. Charlotte Stern, Dr. Jesse Tolmach, and Mrs. Bobbie

Weinstein to produce the books, papers, and records of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, together with all the facts relating thereto, before the Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives.

#### EXTENDING THE PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 6042

An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "March 31, 1947."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, the Stabilization Act of 1942, or the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers and processors and distributors (including retailers) of such commodity the sum of (1) the current cost of producing and processing and distributing such commodity as determined by the established commercial accounting practices of the industry, and (2) a reasonable profit thereon.

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "March 31, 1947."

SEC. 4. Title I of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1 thereof a new section as follows:

#### "REMOVAL OF PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

"SEC. 1A. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the general control of prices and wages, and the use of the subsidy powers conferred by section 2 (e) of this act, shall be terminated, without further extension, not later than June 30, 1947, and that on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished. The Price Administrator (and the Secretary of Agriculture to the extent of his responsibility under section 3 (e) of this act) shall proceed immediately to formulate a comprehensive plan for the progressive removal of price controls and subsidies in order that the return to a free market and to free collective bargaining may be accomplished on or before June 30, 1947, without disturbance of the national economy. On or before October 1, 1946, the Price Administrator shall report to Congress the plan so formulated together with the measures which he has taken and will take to execute the plan. The President shall, not later than January 2, 1947, report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations, are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of the powers granted by this act as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to the established departments or agencies of the Government which should be charged with the administration of such powers.

"(b) (1) Maximum price controls shall be removed as hereafter set forth.

"(2) In the case of any nonagricultural commodity or class of commodities the producers of which are not represented by an industry advisory committee as provided in